

Concordia Theological Monthly

Vol. XIII

SEPTEMBER, 1942

No. 9

Leading Thoughts on Eschatology in the Epistles to the Thessalonians

VII

The passage chosen for the seventh and final article on the leading thoughts on eschatology in St. Paul's letters to the Thessalonians is one of special beauty and rich content. In the preceding articles we have shown on the basis of the two letters that the Lord will surely come, and come suddenly, as a thief in the night, 1 Thess. 5:1-3; that He will not come before the Man of Sin has made his appearance, 2 Thess. 2:1-12; that when He comes, He will come to take vengeance upon the unbelievers and to glorify the believers, 2 Thess. 1:3-12. In the passage which we shall consider in the final installment, 1 Thess. 4, 13-18, the apostle points out that Christ's Second Advent will transpire in separate acts. In vivid detail St. Paul pictures four separate and distinct events occurring at His coming, 1) Jesus will appear in glory; 2) the dead in Christ shall rise; 3) the Christians still living shall together with those raised from the dead be caught up; 4) together they shall ever be with the Lord. 1 Thess. 4:13-18. Because of the importance and heavenly comfort of these lessons the ancient Church has very properly chosen this passage also, as one of the great eschatological pericopes of the church year, assigning it as the epistle for the Twenty-fifth Sunday after Trinity.

"I would not have you to be ignorant, brethren, concerning them which are asleep, that ye sorrow not, even as others which have no hope." V. 13. "I would not have you to be ignorant," is a transitional form introducing a new and important thought; cp. Rom. 11:25; 1 Cor. 10:1; compare also the positive expression "I would have you know," 1 Cor. 11:3; Col. 2:1. While the matter he has in mind is not altogether unknown to Paul's readers and, in fact, was referred to already in this letter, cp. 2:19; 3:13, it is of

sufficient importance to warrant a more thorough instruction, particularly since the Thessalonians were in need of such indoctrination, as we gather from vv. 10 and 11 and 3:10. Far from addressing the disturbed and perplexed Christians in harsh terms, reprimanding them for their ignorance or forgetfulness, he admonishes them as beloved brothers. The tone and spirit of the entire passage prove the sincerity of his brotherly affection, his patience with the young Christians, realizing that many of them had emerged from the ignorance and superstition of pagandom only a short while ago.

Paul's intention is to instruct them with regard "to them which are asleep." This phrase is used as a euphemism for "those who have died." It is the translation of the Hebrew שָׁכַב, 1 Kings 2:10. A similar Greek term is καθεύδειν, 1 Thess. 5:10, which means "to sleep," while κοιμᾶν means "to cause to sleep"; the middle and passive, "to sleep, to fall asleep." Adopting the language of Christ, John 11:11, Paul frequently uses this term for those who died as believers in Jesus, 1 Cor. 11:30; 15:6, 18. This expression was used also by the Greeks and Romans, who often designated death as a brother of sleep, since the dead person resembles one sleeping. Christianity has injected a new content into the word. When one has fallen asleep, he again awakes, arises, returns to the activities of his calling. This term, therefore, is especially suitable in this connection where the apostle is about to speak of the resurrection of the dead.

The *textus receptus* has the perfect tense, "who have fallen asleep," other texts, the present, "who are asleep." Both readings are well attested. The present tense seems to be preferable, since Paul usually employs the preterite, cp. vv. 14 and 15, and therefore the perfect may be a scribal correction of the unusual present. We translate: those sleeping, those falling asleep. Paul does not teach a soul-sleep. He is not a defender of psychopannychism, an intermediate state of semiconsciousness, during which the soul is neither happy nor unhappy. Scripture knows nothing of such a state. Cp. Phil. 1:23; Rev. 14:13; 1 Cor. 15:20.

In this connection Paul does not speak of the general resurrection of all the dead taught Dan. 12:2 and John 5:28, 29. He has in mind only believers, particularly such members of the Thessalonian congregation as had fallen asleep; cp. vv. 14 and 16. The definite article v. 13 points out those sleeping as well known to the readers. It seems that the Thessalonian Christians had submitted definite questions to Paul with reference to their dead fellow Christians, or Timothy may have reported their misgivings to the apostle. Chap. 3:6. The Thessalonians were not asking for information on the status of their relatives and friends who had died as pagans. They were rather disturbed and perplexed with regard

to those relatives and fellow Christians who had died before the Advent of Christ for which they were waiting so anxiously. Would not these departed brethren be at a disadvantage over against those who would live to see Christ's coming? Would they participate to the same extent and in like manner as the survivors in the glorification of the congregation on Yonder Day? Would they be present at the glorious return of the Savior and take part in that joyous meeting of the believing Christians with their Savior coming to lead His Bride into the bridal chamber of heaven? They feared that those who had fallen asleep would be raised from their graves only after the Savior had come to meet His saints on earth. That this was the real cause of their misgivings is clearly brought out vv. 15-17. The Thessalonians did not fear that those that slept would remain in death's power forever; they did not, like some in the congregation at Corinth, deny the resurrection, 1 Cor. 15. Paul had invariably preached the doctrine of resurrection everywhere, also in Thessalonica, as one of the chief articles of the Christian religion, 1 Cor. 15:3. If the Thessalonians had denied or doubted the resurrection of the body, Paul would have been obliged to prove this doctrine, as he did in 1 Cor. 15. Only one question disturbed them, owing either to a misunderstanding of the apostle's instruction or to their own speculations: the relation of the resurrection to the Parousia. Neither is there the slightest justification for the assumption that the Thessalonians believed in a second general resurrection, in which their dead friends and relatives would participate without enjoying the glories and happiness of the millennium. There is not a trace in the entire Bible of a first and second *bodily* resurrection. That is an invention of the chiliasts, which cannot be proved from Scripture, nor, as we shall see, from v. 16, "the dead in Christ shall rise *first*."

The purpose Paul has in mind in addressing his instruction and consolation is "that ye sorrow not even as others which have no hope." The *καί* after *καθώς* is quite a common idiom. The "others" are the non-Christians, the Gentiles, Eph. 2:3. Included in this term, however, are the Jewish Sadducees, who denied not only the resurrection, Matt. 22:23, but who also refused to believe in a life of the soul after death and held that the soul died with the body, as Josephus writes (*Antiquities*, XVIII:1, 4). The heathen mourn their dead because they have no hope. They do not look forward to an eternal life, everlasting bliss. Eph. 2:12. Most of the heathen believe that death is the final end of all things. Individual heathen, as Socrates, Plato, Cicero, Seneca, endeavored to prove the immortality of the soul and to derive some measure of comfort for themselves and others from their philosophy. Yet they denied the possibility of the resurrection of the body, did not even refer to it.

The future state of man in the nether world was a sad one, far inferior to life in this world, a mere shadowy existence. In vain did they seek to shake off that fear of death because of which all men are during their whole lifetime subject to bondage. Heb. 2:15. Hopelessness with regard to happiness and bliss after death is one of the characteristics of heathenism. For this reason, heathen lament and bewail their dead so loudly, so hopelessly. One may read passages corroborating this word of the apostle culled from the writings of Homer, Theokritos, Aeschylus, Catullus, Lucretius, Cicero, Lucian in the notes on our passage in the commentaries of Eadie, Riggerbach, and others.

Christians are not to mourn their dead in this manner. The Thessalonians need not be without hope. Theirs is a marvelously glorious outlook with regard to the fate of their beloved ones fallen asleep. Note that *καθώς* is a particle of comparison, not of degree. We must not translate: that ye sorrow not in the measure, in the degree as others do. The mourning of Christians is to be of a different nature from that hopeless mourning of the heathen. Paul does not forbid mourning and weeping over our dead. He does not regard every lamentation, every dirge as unchristian and heathenish. Scripture nowhere demands a stoic apathy. It acknowledges the anguish caused by death and the separation from our loved ones, John 11:35; Phil. 2:27. The saints of the Old Testament mourned for their dead and wept for them, but in a manner altogether different from that of the heathen. Gen. 23:2; 24:67; 50:10; Lev. 19:28; Deut. 14:1. Christians must not sorrow in hopelessness, must never descend to the level of those who are without Christ, without God, without hope in this world, Eph. 2:12. Therefore they must moderate their sorrow and the expressions of their sorrow. For the Christian, death has lost its sting. Death to the Christian is not annihilation, neither the gateway to eternal torment, but the portal to eternal, blissful communion with the Lord, 1 Cor. 15:55-57.

"For if we believe that Jesus died and rose again, even so them also which sleep in Jesus will God bring with Him." V.14. Paul proves his statement that Christians must not mourn their dead in the fashion of the heathen. We read, if we believe. The hypothetical *εἰ* is not problematic, but presupposes existence of true, living faith. It is syllogistic. If we really believe what we believe; if we do not merely regard it as an historical fact that Jesus died and rose again; if we really believe that, that is to say, if we place our trust and confidence in this death and resurrection of Jesus, our Savior, then the conclusion is inevitable: God will bring those which sleep in Jesus with Jesus. The one and the other are articles of faith, the second following by divine logic from the first. Between

Jesus and those that sleep in Jesus there exists a most intimate connection, so that where He is, there they also are. Where the head is, there must the members be. 1 Cor. 15:20, 23. This inseparable unity and connection has been brought about by the death and resurrection of Jesus. Jesus died for us, 1 Thess. 5:10, and has risen for us. By His suffering and death He has redeemed us to be His own, and by His resurrection He has sealed us as His own possession. We are His own, and therefore we must be where He is, John 12:26; 17:24.

Paul does not place the emphasis on the power of God, as if to say, because God has raised Jesus, He is able to bring them which sleep in Jesus with Him. The apostle stresses the death and resurrection of Jesus. That is the premise from which the conclusion follows. Jesus, the Crucified and Risen, is the living surety that God will bring those that sleep in Him with Him. This argumentation proves in the first place that Paul speaks here only of such as have fallen asleep in the faith of Jesus; in the second place, that the death and resurrection of Jesus were acknowledged by the Thessalonian Christians as indisputable facts and absolute truth; else Paul would have been obliged to prove these facts and could not have used them as the basis of his argumentation; thirdly, that the Thessalonians were worried because their dead fellow Christians might be at a disadvantage over against the living at the Advent of Christ. Their worry was not that their dead would not at all be raised; else Paul would have drawn a different conclusion from his premise, such as, So then God will raise your deceased fellow believers also. He does say, God will bring them which sleep in Jesus with Him. He presupposes that their resurrection is conceded.

Speaking of Jesus' death and resurrection, the apostle uses the name Jesus; and he does not say, Jesus has fallen asleep, but directly and without figurative language, Jesus has actually died and actually rose again. Οὕτως, even so, does not merely introduce the apodosis; it draws the conclusion in the form of a comparison, "in like manner," cp. Rom. 5:12; and καί emphasizes the comparison. Note that Paul does not continue, We believe that God in like manner, etc.; he simply states it as a fact, In like manner God will, etc. Opinions differ on the connection of διὰ τοῦ Ἰησοῦ. Luther and many other commentators connect it with κοιμηθέντες, "them which sleep through Jesus." That would be a proper translation if the preposition ἐν were used, as in v. 16, "the dead in Christ," and in 1 Cor. 15:18; Rev. 14:13. But διὰ is never equivalent to ἐν and can be translated only, "them that are fallen asleep through Jesus." It always designates the medium whereby something is done. For this reason the phrase is to be

connected with ἀξει, "will bring through Jesus," although this verb is already modified by σὺν αὐτῷ, with Him. This connection may be somewhat harsh linguistically, but it is not impossible and is chosen here purposely to insure greater emphasis. The meaning is, those who sleep, God will bring through Jesus with Jesus. Christ is the Mediator of the bringing of the believers to salvation as well as of their resurrection. Cp. 1 Cor. 15:21, 22; Phil. 3:21; John 5:28. In order to emphasize this thought, Paul states here directly that God will bring those having fallen asleep with Jesus, so that when Jesus appears, they are actually with Him in His company and fellowship. Hence they will in no wise be at a disadvantage as compared with those that lived till Jesus' coming. They will fully participate in the grace and in the glory of His appearance. And ἀξει here does not mean to lead away, *abducere*, but to bring forward, *adducere*, as the Vulgate translates correctly. When on the Last Day God will bring His Son visibly into the world, Heb. 1:6, then He will through Jesus bring with Jesus also those that have fallen asleep, after He has through Jesus raised them from the dead and re-united their body and soul, cp. v. 16.

"For this we say unto you by the word of the Lord, that we which are alive and remain unto the coming of the Lord shall not prevent them which are asleep." V. 15. Solemnly Paul emphasizes and proves his statement that at His second Advent Jesus will bring with Himself all that have fallen asleep in Him. "This," τοῦτο, therefore does not refer to the preceding statement but to what the apostle is about to say. Paul speaks not merely with apostolic authority and on the basis of his infallible knowledge of the truth; his statement rests on a specific word of the Lord, the Christ. That is the meaning of ἐν λόγῳ κυρίου, in, by virtue of a word of the Lord. Cp. 1 Kings 20:35. The statement, of course, would have been just as true and trustworthy even if he could not have quoted a word of Christ. Paul is writing by inspiration of God; his word is God's word. 1 Thess. 2:13; 1 Cor. 2:13. For the sake of his readers he uses this and similar expressions. Cp. 1 Cor. 11:23. What is meant by "a word of the Lord"? Interpreters have seen a reference to Christ's eschatological speech and have compared Matt. 24:30, 31 or 25:1-13; because of the εἰς ἀπάντησιν, "to meet the Lord" in v. 17 (Luthardt). Hofmann prefers a reference to Matt. 16:27, 28. But none of these passages say what Paul says here, and the interpreter must supply the chief thought. Others hold that Paul quotes one of the words of Jesus preserved by tradition; cp. Acts 20:35. (Calvin, v. Zezschwitz.) The most plausible suggestion is that Paul received this word by direct revelation; cp. 1 Cor. 11:23; 15:51; 2 Cor. 12:1, 9; Gal. 1:12; 2:2; Eph. 3:3;

Acts 22:17-21. (Calov, Alford, De Wette, Luenemann, Nebe.)
 Cp. Luther's sermons, St. L., XII:2032 ff.

The content of the Lord's word is stated by Paul in two clauses. The first, v. 15, introducing the word, the second adding the reason, vv. 16 and 17, for the statement of v. 15. Paul says, we which are alive, we who shall still be living when Christ comes. This translation is demanded by the context, which contrasts those that live to see the Advent with those who fall asleep before this Day, cp. vv. 13-17. This first participle is at once explained by a second participle, "that remain," whom God permits to remain alive until the Advent of the Lord, *εις*, "unto," designating the *terminus ad quem*. Both participles are present participles and must not be translated as futures. They describe the present state as continuing until the Parousia. On *παρουσία* cp. chaps. 2:19; 3:13. Paul means to say, we certainly shall have no precedence over those who are sleeping, as far as the meeting with Christ and participation in His glory are concerned. That is the point on which the Thessalonians were in doubt. They sorrowed because those sleeping would be at a disadvantage at the Day of Christ's Coming. Paul shows that those living on that Day will not precede them that sleep, will not take part in Christ's glory prior to those that have died in the faith. On the contrary, if any precede, it is those sleeping. They shall rise first incorruptible, and then those living shall be changed, vv. 16 and 17; 1 Cor. 15:51 and 52. *Φθάσωμεν*, "prevent," is here used in its usual sense of precede, come earlier, before. The English word "prevent" here retains its original Latin meaning, to come before. The double negative οὐ μή emphasizes that something shall certainly not occur.

These words of Paul can be understood only as an expression of Pauls' expectation that he together with his readers would live to see the Lord's coming. Paul did not live to see it. More than 1800 years have passed since this expectation was voiced. Hence many interpreters conclude that Paul was mistaken. Others turn and twist the clear words, so that they no longer refer to Paul and his contemporaries but to the Christians actually living at the Parousia. Both interpretations are wrong. We have no reason to charge Paul with having been mistaken, least of all in this case, where he quotes a word of the Lord. On the other hand, the words must be interpreted as they read, and undoubtedly they refer to Paul and his readers. Interpreters who refer these words to the Christians living at the Last Day, regard them as figurative language, as an *enallage personae* or an *ἀνακρίνωσις*, *communicatio*, attributing an action or a state to a whole body while it actually refers to only a part of it. According to this interpretation, Paul wanted to say that we Christians in general, that is to say, those of

us who are still alive at the Advent of Christ, the Church of the latter days, shall not precede those that sleep. While "we," ἡμεῖς, may be used in this communicative sense, this usage can hardly apply here, since very clearly two classes of Christians are contrasted, "we which are alive" and "they which are asleep." Moreover, chap. 5:4 the same statement is made concerning those that live at Paul's time, and cannot be taken figuratively as referring only to those living at the end. Other interpreters, therefore, suggest as the correct sense: "we who live in our posterity." That is adding a thought not expressed in the words. Still others translate hypothetically: we, if, provided, we are still alive. This interpretation is rendered impossible by the definite article, which identifies the survivors with "we." All these interpretations are makeshifts. We must not forget that the time of the Advent is unknown to man, unknown also to the apostle. Mark 13:32; Acts 1:7; 1 Thess. 5:1-4. Whenever Paul therefore speaks of the Last Day, he must speak of it as if it could possibly come during his lifetime. Cp. 1 Cor. 15:51, 52; 1 Cor. 7:29-31; 1:7, 8; Rom. 13:11; Phil. 4:5; 1 Thess. 5:4. And since in our passage and in 1 Cor. 15 two classes of Christians are distinguished, the living and dead, Paul could not speak otherwise than he does, since he certainly belonged to the living while writing these letters. (These two classes, of course, were in a state of constant flux.) On the other hand, Paul was not certain whether he would live to see the Day of the Lord. That is evident from our letter, chap. 5:10, "whether we wake or sleep." Here we have the key that solves the difficulty, particularly since Paul elsewhere speaks of the Parousia as in the distant future, and as if he were one of those to be raised on that Day. Cp. 1 Cor. 6:14 (which casts an illuminating light on 1 Cor. 15:51 and our passage); 2 Cor. 4:14; Phil. 3:20, 21; Acts 20:29; Phil. 2:17; 2 Tim. 4:6. We must not forget that Paul knew that the Man of Sin would have to be revealed before the Parousia, 2 Thess. 2. These passages give us the clue to the correct interpretation of our passage. All that is necessary is to picture to ourselves vividly the situation in apostolic times. The last of the wonderful works of God had been accomplished in the outpouring of the Holy Spirit. Only one remained, the return of Christ unto judgment. For this day the Christians longed and prayed with earnest desire. But at no time could they know for certain whether they would live to see this day, live to see the revelation of the Man of Sin, live to see him consumed by the spirit of the Lord's mouth and destroyed with the brightness of Christ's coming, 2 Thess. 2:3, 8. Else they would have actually known the times and seasons, Acts 1:7, that day and that hour which no man knoweth, Mark 13:32. Cp. Acts 1:11; Matt. 16:27; 24:25; 1 Pet.

4:7; James 5:8; 1 John 2:18, and the eschatological discourses of our Lord.

"For the Lord Himself shall descend from heaven with a shout, with the voice of the archangel and with the trump of God; and the dead in Christ shall rise first." V. 16. Verses 16 and 17 prove the assertion that the living shall not precede the dead in the Lord's Advent; they picture the succession of the separate stages of the Parousia. "Himself," αὐτός, like 3:11, is the subject, emphatically placed at the beginning of the sentence; "the Lord" is the ap-position. Himself, the Lord, the main person, will appear in person, descending from heaven. Purposely He is again called "the Lord," as in v. 15, not "Jesus," as in v. 14. The Lord comes in the fullness of His glory and majesty. He will descend from heaven upon the earth, for the crucified and risen Savior now is enthroned at the right hand of God in the heavens, Rom. 8:34; Eph. 1:20; Col. 3:1; Phil. 3:20. Now He will come upon the earth for the second time but in a manner altogether different from His first coming; in a novel, unheard-of manner. Cp. Acts 1:11. This coming is described by three prepositional phrases. He comes "with a shout." Ἔν in connection with verbs of coming denotes accompaniment, together with; and κέλευσμα, occurring only here, designates the commanding word of a military officer, of the general, a military order rousing the army to action. Luther's translation, "Feldgeschrei," the shout of the soldiers, is incorrect, and the "shout" of the Authorized Version not exact enough. The word is also used of the command issued by the driver to his horses, of hunters to the dogs, of the captain of a ship to the rowers. This word of command does not issue from the Father. It is Christ's command directed to all His own sleeping in their graves. As the general rouses his army to renewed activity after the night's rest, so the great Captain of our salvation rouses His followers, His warriors, from the sleep of death, John 5:28, 29. Christ descends "with the voice of the archangel." At His coming Christ will be surrounded by myriads of angels; cp. 1 Thess. 3:13; 2 Thess. 1:7; Matt. 13:41; 16:27; 24:31; 25:31. Among these angels there are various orders and classes, and the highest order, the leaders, are the archangels. One of these leaders is Michael, Jude 9; Rev. 12:7 (although both passages may refer to Christ Himself), and accordingly some interpreters believe that Michael is the archangel referred to here; others suggest Gabriel, Dan. 8:16; Luke 1:19, 26, although he is never called an archangel; still others, Raphael, Tobit 12:15; cp. with Rev. 8:2. The term archangel corresponds to the term "prince," Dan. 10:13, 21; 12:1. No matter who this archangel is, on the Last Day he is Christ's herald, proclaiming His coming and perhaps Christ's resurrection command. Christ descends from heaven "with

the trump of God." The Jews used trumpets to call the people together, Num. 10:2; 31:6; Joel 2:1. The manifestations of God in the Old Testament were frequently accompanied by the sound of trumpets; Ex. 19:16; Heb. 12:19; Ps. 47:6; Zech. 9:14. So Christ's glorious Advent will be ushered in by the blowing of the trumpet of God, 1 Cor. 15:52; Matt. 24:31, so called in contrast to man-made trumpets to convene an assembly at some man's command. Here it is God and His Christ, God of God, Lord of Lord, who proclaims a unique, marvelous assembly. This trump of God, sounded by the archangel or another member of the angelic host, is the divine signal, the command of Omnipotence, that the dead shall rise, 1 Cor. 15:52. The sound of this trumpet penetrates the graves of all the believers wherever they may rest. The sound of this trumpet has divine, living, life-giving power. We read accordingly, "And the dead in Christ shall rise." It will hardly be necessary to state that we cannot define the nature of this trumpet. Heavenly facts and events are pictured in language that man can understand; cp. Rev. 8:1-13.

The resurrection of the dead is the purpose intended and achieved by the Advent of Christ; καί therefore is consecutive, "and so"; "and in consequence of this," "the dead in Christ shall rise first." The phrase "in Christ" is correctly connected with "the dead"; it does not belong to "shall rise." That this resurrection is made possible only by Christ is evident from the entire context, while it was necessary to state to which dead the statement is to be referred. The apostle removes all doubt as to this question. The dead in Christ, those dead that have fallen asleep in Christ and even in death are still united with Christ; cp. Rom. 14:8, 9; these dead alone are in the mind of the apostle in this entire context. He speaks of the relation of the Christians having fallen asleep to those still living when He shall come. Cp. 1 Cor. 15:18, 23; Rev. 14:13. Grammatically this interpretation would seem to demand the definite article before ἐν Χριστῷ, but there are exceptions to this rule, as Winer and other grammarians have proved.

"The dead in Christ shall rise *first*." Very emphatically the adverb is placed at the end of this statement, adding another amazing and comforting fact to the amazing truth of the resurrection of believers. This "first" is the definite and satisfactory answer to the questions and doubts of the Thessalonians.

But just this little word "first" has been pointed out by chiliasts of every time and age as incontrovertibly proving a first resurrection, the resurrection of the just referred to in Luke 14:14, a thousand years later than which the resurrection of the wicked would take place, Rev. 20. This interpretation, the favorite one in our day among the Fundamentalists, has absolutely no foundation in the

word "first" as used by Paul in our passage. The word "first" cannot mean here a first resurrection in contrast to a second one occurring later. That is made impossible by the clause introduced by "then," *ἐπειτα*, v. 17. This clause does not speak of a second resurrection, nor of a time much later, but of an event connected with the coming of the Lord, v. 16, and the resurrection of those having fallen asleep prior to this coming; and this event is not the resurrection of the wicked, nor a resurrection at all, but of the catching up in the clouds of those living, together with, at the same time with, those having been raised from their graves. The unmistakable purpose of the passage is to allay the fear of the Thessalonians that their deceased fellow Christians would be at a disadvantage on the Day of the Coming of Jesus. Far from falling short of any blessing and joy of that Day, they will rather be the first to experience its blessed miraculous power; they will be raised from death and corruption, body and soul re-united, and then only, and not before, those having lived until that Day will be caught up; and again not a moment before those that had died, but together with them. We have already repeatedly called attention to the fact that this whole passage deals with the resurrection of the dead Christians and that the *scopus*, the purpose of this instruction, is to comfort the Christians with respect to their deceased brethren in faith, v. 18. We repeat that the apostle in the present discussion leaves out of consideration entirely the general resurrection which is taught Dan. 12: 2; John 5: 28, 29; 2 Cor. 5: 10; Acts 17: 31, 32; 24: 25. Neither can chiliasts defend their doctrine of two separate resurrections by referring to Rev. 20. There John speaks of spiritual resurrection, as can readily be proved. If a resurrection of the body were meant, only the martyrs would participate in this resurrection, only those "that were beheaded for the witness of Jesus," Rev. 20: 4. Furthermore, only the *souls* are spoken of as living, while not a word is said about the re-union of the soul with the body. Finally, only martyrs could then escape "the second death," v. 6, "the lake of fire," v. 14. According to Scripture, resurrection consists in the restoration of *bodily* life, in the re-union of the soul, the principle of life, with its body, from which it was separated by death.

"Then we which are alive and remain shall be caught up together with them in the clouds to meet the Lord in the air; and so shall we ever be with the Lord." V. 17. We have seen that "then" refers to "first," the closing word of v. 16. It introduces the second result of the Lord's coming down to the earth. First the resurrection takes place, then the rapture. The "then" closely links these two acts. In this context the implied sense is "only then" when the dead believers have been raised, then and not at some

earlier period of time. The phrase "we which are alive and remain" is to be taken in the same sense as in v. 15. "Together with them" refers to the believers who had died but are now raised. "Together," *ἅμα*, here does not mean all without exception, as, e. g., Rom. 3:12. It is used here not numerically but temporally, at the same time with them, as, e. g., Acts 24:26. Those who have been raised and those who were still alive will be caught up at the same time and in one company. Before the rapture can take place, the transformation taught 1 Cor. 15:51-54; Phil. 3:20, 21 must have occurred. Our corruptible earthly body, the natural body, will be changed into a spiritual, glorified body, similar to Christ's glorified body. Only then is the rapture possible; cp. 1 Cor. 15:44, 50. Both the transformation and the rapture takes place "in a moment, in the twinkling of an eye," 1 Cor. 15:52. We "shall be caught up," literally, snatched, carried off suddenly. The term describes the swiftness and irresistible force by which those raised up together with the living ones will be carried upward. The term is to be understood as a real and actual bodily lifting up, ascending through the air. The passive denotes this ascent as one not due to our own strength, but to the power of God. Acts 8:39. This ascension, or rapture, takes place "in the clouds." In the original the article is missing. We shall be caught up in clouds, either surrounded by clouds, or preferably, upon clouds, riding and sitting upon them as upon a throne. Clouds appear elsewhere in Scripture as the heavenly triumphal chariot. As such they serve God when He comes down from heaven; as such they serve the Christians when they are lifted up from the earth to heaven. Cp. Dan. 7:13; Acts 1:9, 11; Matt. 24:30; 26:64; Rev. 1:7; 14:14; 2 Kings 2:11; Rev. 11:12. The clouds of heaven descend to carry upward those ascending from the earth. As the Lord comes in majesty and glory, so they that are the Lord's own shall be carried toward Him gloriously, majestically. What a marvelous prospect! What a unique promise, approximated only Matt. 25:6. The purpose of this ascent is "to meet the Lord," to be led into His presence. "In the air" is to be connected with "caught up" and means simply "into the air," *εἰς ἄερα*, not "through the air," or "into heaven." The apostle does not mean to say that the air is to be the abiding dwelling place of the Christians together with Christ. The air, the atmosphere surrounding our earth, is merely their meeting place, when Christ descends from heaven and the glorified saints ascend towards Him. They meet midway between heaven and earth, in the air. The believers go forth to meet the Lord, as the chief citizens of a commonwealth go forth to meet and greet and welcome their returning king; as a bride hurries forth to be with her bridegroom; cp. 2 Thess. 2:1; Matt. 24:31. In this manner God shall through Jesus

bring with Jesus those that have fallen asleep, v. 14. The other event of that great Day, the final Judgment of the world, is not mentioned here because Paul's purpose was merely to quiet the doubts and misgivings of the Thessalonians concerning their dead fellow Christians. For this reason, in keeping with this purpose, nothing is said of the transformation of the believers and the general resurrection of all the dead.

Paul permits another glance at the unspeakable bliss and joy of yonder world. He states the final goal of the several acts pictured, "and so shall we ever be with the Lord." "So," by virtue of this marvelous meeting and communion with the Lord. "Ever," for all times, without ceasing, we shall be with Him. "With" Him, σὺν, not μετὰ. The latter term expresses rather an external companionship, the former, an intimate fellowship and communion. "We," the living and those that had fallen asleep, together in a happy re-union. Where the Lord is to remain forever with His own, is not stated here; only the inseparable communion is asserted, we forever with the Lord, He forever with us. The place, of course, is heaven, John 14:2, 3; 2 Cor. 5:1; 2 Tim. 4:18; the kingdom of everlasting glory and bliss. We note finally that not all men shall die and that the transformation is not to be regarded as a momentary death, cp. 1 Cor. 15:51.

"Wherefore comfort one another with these words." V. 18. That is the concluding exhortation introduced by the consecutive particle ὥστε, so, on this account, because of the information given. And παρακαλεῖτε in keeping with the context demands the translation, "comfort, console," not "exhort," as in chap. 4:1. It connects with the "sorrow" of v. 13. Comfort one another "with these words," on the basis of these words, vv. 15-17, spoken by the Lord and transmitted to you by me. An inexhaustible wellspring of comfort is here opened to all Christians weeping at the deathbeds and the graves of their loved ones. Their dead are not lost, are not at a disadvantage. They shall rise again, hurry to meet the Lord, to be forever with Him. Let us drink deeply of these living waters! In Oxyrhynchos in Egypt a letter of condolence has been discovered written by an Egyptian woman, Eirene, to a family of her acquaintance, closing with words that seem to agree with these closing words of Paul. And what comfort does Eirene dispense to the mourners? She assures them that together with them she mourns their loss.

"I was grieved and wept as much over Eumoiros as over Didymos, and I did all that was fitting, as did all my family. . . . But still we can do nothing in such a case. So comfort yourselves"; quoted in the Expositor's Greek New Testament *in locum*. That illustrates Paul's expression "as others which have no hope." How

grateful ought we to be for the firm and sure hope that the inspired Word of God, Holy Scripture, offers to us so freely!

Maranatha. The Lord cometh! 1 Cor. 16:22. "And the Spirit and the bride says, Come! And let him that heareth say, Come!" "He which testifieth these things saith, Surely I come quickly! Amen. Even so, come, Lord Jesus!" Rev. 22:17, 21.

L. FUERBRINGER

False Principia Cognoscendi in Theology

The Second of Three Public Lectures Delivered at Concordia Seminary,
St. Louis, Mo., April 15, 1942

It is a fact, admitted also by scientists, that all theological knowledge, in the very nature of the case, must be derived from God Himself. It is a fact, furthermore, that God holds all who venture to speak for Him strictly to His Word when He declares: "To the Law and to the testimony: if they speak not according to this word, it is because there is no light in them." Is. 8:20. Lastly, it is a fact that God has issued a solemn warning by the first and the last writers of our Bible that no man shall dare either to add to or take away aught from the Scriptures, Deut. 4:2; Rev. 22:18, 19. This being so, we are amazed at the audacity of men who have tried to substitute for the Word of God, either in part or whole, a different source of knowledge for theology, to the incalculable damage of true theology.

Foremost among false *principia cognoscendi* in theology is human reason, not only that of outsiders to the Christian religion, but also that of the Christian himself. Attacks from this quarter upon theology come partly in the form of open defiance to, and absolute rejection of, the teachings of theology, which are denounced not only as supranatural, beyond reason, but also as unreasonable, contrary to common intelligence; as attempts to hypnotize the thinking faculty in man and to deprive him of his judgment. Partly these attacks come in the form of subtle insinuations to the theologian himself, who imagines that he must make the deep truths of God's revelation acceptable to the reason of men and that he is able to do so, because he has become enlightened by the Holy Spirit through his study of the divine Word and therefore can produce reasonable explanations of matters which on first blush appear inexplicable.

Now, evidently the theologian must employ his ordinary intelligence in his study of the Scriptures as of any other writing. To begin with, he must be able to read, to understand the meaning of words, to perceive the right connection of words to one another, and the structure of sentences and groups of sentences. When-

ever he meets with similar utterances, he must convince himself whether they are actually identical or whether there are essential dissimilarities between the statements. He must store the results of his observation in his memory. In all these actions the intellect serves the theologian like a faithful servant or maid in a household. This is called the ministerial, or ancillary, use of reason. Because of this service the theologian grasps the plain literal meaning of what he is reading in his Bible.

But reason may assert: "These things cannot be so. True, the text is plain, but what it says runs counter to correct thinking. Therefore it must be given a different interpretation from what its language imports, or it must be rejected as false." In that case human reason would no longer be content with repeating what God has said, but would set itself up as superior to God and assume the authority of deciding whether God could have said this or that and whether He meant what He said. Reason would no longer be the humble servant, but the sovereign master of the household. This is called the magisterial use of reason in theology.

There is no room in genuine theology for this use of reason. Wherever it thrusts itself forward, something must take place similar to the expulsion of Agar from the household of Abraham, when God commanded him: "Cast out this bondwoman!" Gen. 21:10, because she had dared to lord it over her mistress Sarah. The theologian gladly accepts the service of human reason for determining the literal meaning of Scripture, but he refuses the arbitration, the dictatorship of reason over the contents, the deep meaning of God's own mind in His utterances. If such a dominant role were accorded to reason in theology, theology would lose its God-given character: it would cease to be "the wisdom from above," and become an hodgepodge of supposedly divine teaching and human learning, a mixture of theology and philosophy. These two simply do not mix. The intrusion of human philosophy into theology works out as when the camel pushes its nose into the Arab's tent and gradually forces its whole bulk into the tent. In the end the foolish Arab, who permitted the camel's nose to come in, has to move out of the tent. God has declared the uselessness of human reason for apprehending the saving truths of Christianity, saying: "I will destroy the wisdom of the wise and will bring to nothing the understanding of the prudent." 1 Cor. 1:19. Accordingly, He has warned the theologians of His Church to "cast down imaginations and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God and to bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ." 2 Cor. 10:5. Only Scripture itself can interpret Scripture. God must be His own

expositor. The clear passages of our Bible must light up the dark and difficult ones.

Therefore the old rule applies here: *Principiis obsta!* that is: Resist an evil at the start! The dominant influence of reason on the teaching of divine matters has been the ruin and downfall of unnumbered Christian churches from the age of the apostles to our own time. It is the plain evidence of decay in the nominal Christianity of today.

Closely related — we might call it its brother or first cousin — to the deceptive *principium cognoscendi* in theology which we have just reviewed is another: the emotions, men's likes and dislikes, their loves and aversions, hopes and fears.

Scripture contains passages of great charm, which attract the natural affections of the human heart. Such are all the Gospel passages that speak of God's condescending love to the lost and straying; of His redemptive arrangements for the salvation of condemned sinners; of His succoring help to the weak, the puny, the erring; of His ready relief to those in distress; stricken sufferers, the poor and needy, the forsaken; of His willingness to hear prayer; of the inward consolations of His Holy Spirit to the restless and despondent. Any heart in trouble feels drawn to these calming, soothing assurances of God's Word.

However, there are also terrifying utterances in the Scriptures: stern commands and prohibitions of God's holy and righteous Law, awful descriptions of sin and its consequences in time and eternity, of God's just retributions to wrongdoers, of His avenging zeal, and of everlasting perdition in hell. These make men shudder with fright and turn away from them. Then there are the incessant urgings to those who would be Christians to walk worthily of their heavenly calling; to sanctify their lives and work out their salvation with fear and trembling; to shun every evil way in thought, word, or deed; to resist both the blandishments and the threatenings of a hostile world; to thwart the wiles of Satan; and to fight against your own flesh and blood. All this seems irksome. When men hear these Scriptures, they are not at all inclined to embrace them, but, like the Israelites at the foot of the quaking mount, they run away from the God, who speaks to them in thunders and lightnings, and cry out: "Let not God speak with us, lest we die." Exod. 20:19. This flight from the Law is an inborn trait of sinful man and a standing obstacle to the saving grace of God.

For while it is a blessed truth of Scripture that God receives sinners, it is equally true that the only sinners whom God welcomes are repentant sinners. They are men who have been put through the crushing experiences of remorse; they have felt the

smitings of their accusing conscience and have trembled before the indictments of God's holy Law and its curses. But that has been their necessary schooling for their faith, for their reception of God's pardon from the forgiving mercy of God. The Law has been their "schoolmaster to bring them unto Christ," Gal. 3:24. They have learned by bitter experience that Christ is a physician only for them that are sick and that the entrance into Christianity and ultimately into the life everlasting is by a strait gate and a narrow path, Matt. 7:14, and that there is no other way, Luke 13:24. There is no saving grace and no forgiveness for sinners who still want to cling to their sins.

Nor can a person remain a Christian without a penitent attitude and a humble spirit. True, the incoming of divine grace into a believing heart brings with it an inward "peace that passeth all understanding," Phil. 4:7, but it brings no other peace. In this world Christians must suffer constant tribulation, Acts 14:22. They are "troubled on every side, without are fightings, within are fears." 2 Cor. 7:5. They have to wage a ceaseless warfare against the wiles of Satan, the blandishments and frownings of a hostile world, and their own treacherous and truant heart. Thus their life is anything but a round of holiday excursions through flowery beds of ease, and their path to glory is a rough and thorny road. John 16:23. In all these conflicts they are trained to "endure hardness, as good soldiers of Christ," 2 Tim. 2:3, and to "fight the good fight of faith and lay hold on eternal life." 1 Tim. 6:12.

A theologian who is swayed by his natural emotions is inclined to offer to his clients the delightful aspects of Christianity and soft-pedal its sterner demands. That will put them on a spiritual sugar diet and raise a type of namby-pamby, good-weather Christians that wilt in the heat of trials and perish in the cold blasts of popular disfavor. It is the bounden duty of every theologian, as it was the duty of St. Paul, "not to shun to declare all the counsel of God" unto men's salvation, Acts 20:27, both the Law and the Gospel, without intermingling the one with the other. To be "approved of God, a workman that needeth not to be ashamed," he must "rightly divide the Word of Truth," 2 Tim. 2:15, and as "a faithful and wise steward of the manifold grace of God," 1 Pet. 4:10, he must give to each member of "the household of God," Eph. 2:19, "his portion of meat in due season," Luke 12:42.

There is a literary gem from the pen of the first President of Concordia, Dr. Walther's *Law and Gospel*, which is a splendid guide, tried and true, to the budding young theologian. It should be the crowning study in pastoral theology and thorough acquaintance with it the indispensable requisite for graduation. For it is a daily mentor to the practicing theologian, warning him to keep

a checkrein on his natural emotions and curbs his antinomian leanings and tendencies. For these have inflicted in the past, and are still inflicting today, untold damage on the Church of our Lord Jesus Christ.

Without fear or favor the theologian — to speak with William Chillingworth — must set forth “the Word of God, the whole Word, and nothing but the Word.”

That brings us to another false *principium cognoscendi* in theology.

The Scriptures are a perfect means of grace; for they are “the power of God,” Rom. 1:16, “able to make men wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus,” 2 Tim. 3:15. But that is where they stop. They do not satisfy men’s curiosity on many points. There are lacunae, hiatus, gaps, where the Bible leaves the desire for more knowledge unfulfilled. Paul writes: “We know in part, and we prophesy,” that is, preach, “in part. But when that which is perfect is come, then that which is in part shall be done away. . . . Now we see through a glass darkly; but then face to face; now I know in part; then shall I know even as also I am known.” 1 Cor. 13:9, 10, 12. “It does not yet appear,” says John, “what we shall be; but we know that when He,” namely, Jesus, “shall appear, we shall be like Him; for we shall see Him as He is,” 1 John 3:2. Jesus forbore telling His disciples more things than He did “because,” said He, “ye cannot bear them now.” John 16:12. God has not poured out in His present revelation all that may be known about Him and divine affairs, because our present powers of comprehension could not encompass them. It is really an act of divine mercy that God has not told us all that we should like to know. It requires a transformation of our present vile body and mind into the new body and mind of glory, and the light of glory, to grasp them. Phil. 3:21.

But at this point the impatience of men has tried to fill up the gaps in Scripture and even to furnish information where there are no gaps, by means of dreams, visions, a so-called “inner light,” which are claimed to have given them new revelations. It is the human fantasy, or imagination, that is behind these phenomena. Men are known to have assumed that all the thoughts which flit through their minds, while they sit poring over their Bible, came out of the Holy Book, while they were merely longings to know more than the Book reveals, wishful thinking that produces a specious conviction. It is likewise known that men have told a fiction so often that in the end they believed it themselves. This is not at all an unusual occurrence in the history of religion, and there are numerous points where the imaginative faculty in men has contacted Christianity also and has produced a swarm of

enthusiasts, fanatics — Luther calls them *Schwärmer* — who became frenzied, rabid advocates of their special revelations.

There is no warrant for this in Scripture, no promise that God would in this manner expand or revise "the faith once delivered unto the saints," for which He has commanded them to "contend earnestly," Jude 3. God has forever built up His Church "upon the foundation of the apostles and prophets, Jesus Christ Himself being the chief Cornerstone," Eph. 2:20, and has declared: "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." 1 Cor. 3:11. Men may build on this foundation "wood, hay, stubble," but these shall not stand the test, vv. 12, 13, and only the "word of the Lord shall endure for ever," Peter assures his readers and adds: "This is the word which by the Gospel is preached unto you." 1 Pet. 1:25.

Furthermore, God has instructed His people how to deal with "dreamers of dreams," Deut. 13:1-13, and has warned them against "false prophets," Matt. 8:15, and their "signs and lying wonders," 2 Thess. 2:9, who shall make their appearance especially at the end.

The wise theologian, therefore, puts a curb on his fancies.

Worse than these hallucinations of ecstatic minds are the plain intentional perversions of Scripture by Mohammed in the Koran, by Joseph Smith in the Book of Mormon, by Swedenborg in his *Divina Arcana* (Divine Secrets) and other writings, and by Mary Baker Eddy in her *Science and Health, with Key to the Scriptures*. Garbling portions and thoughts of the Bible, these people have woven their grotesque and absurd vaporings around them or have invented impossible, fantastic meanings for current Bible terms, so that, while apparently speaking Scripture, they utter nothing but contradictions and denials of Scripture. These products are not new revelations but barefaced falsifications and impostures, not worth the notice of an honest searcher after God's truth.

There is time left for only brief references to a few more false *principia cognoscendi* in theology. Such an one is the claim advanced chiefly by the Anglican Church in support of their dogma of the "apostolic succession," namely, that the consentient teaching of the early Christian Church of the first five centuries is important for finding out Christian truth. For — so runs the argument — what the first Christians harmoniously believed and taught, must be a source of knowledge to the theologian.

However, in the first place, the earliest teachers of the Christian Church either wrote very little or their writings were lost, possibly consumed in the conflagration of the library of Alexandria in 391. Secondly, what has come down to us of such Christian writings does not at all present a picture of perfect unity. There are differences among the early Christian teachers. Lastly, what unity there exists, must be measured against the standard of

doctrine, the Holy Scriptures, so that even their assumed harmony cannot be an *independent* source of theological information, apart from Scripture, but is at best only a welcome testimony to the authority of the Sacred Writings, which the early Christians faithfully accepted.

The Roman Church operates with two false *principia cognoscendi* in theology: first, the oral traditions, supposed to have been handed down in the Church from generation to generation. These traditions are fortuitous outcroppings of human minds, occupied with sacred matters. They have been elevated arbitrarily above the authority of the Scriptures and have been the source of teachings contrary to Scripture; they have served to fill the books of legends of saints with fabulous stories; they have been tyrannically enforced by hierarchs as binding on the consciences of Christians. Paul vigorously opposed the introduction into his teaching even of the Law of Moses, given by God, and of all human traditions, like those of the elders of the Jewish Church.

Traditions can be useful merely as testimonies to God's truth, if they are in harmony with Scripture; if they are contrary to it, it is plain that the Christian theologian must reject them.

The other false principle of the Roman Church is the infallibility of their Pope. If such a prerogative ever can be accorded a mere human being, the Popes themselves have destroyed it before Pío Nono by the bull "Pastor Aeternus" proclaimed it on July 18, 1870, while a fierce thunderstorm was passing over Rome. For from their seats of authority the Popes have not only sanctioned plain heresies, but have also in their pronouncements regarding the faith of the Church openly contradicted each other. While this dogma stands, consistent Romanists really must ask each other every morning: "What do we believe today?" It is a question whether thinking members of that Church sincerely believe this haughty dogma which exalts a puny and erring human being "above all that is called God or that is worshiped, so that he as God sitteth in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God." 2 Thess. 2:4.

For mark you! the infallibility bull declares that the official decrees of the Roman pontiff possess that validity with which Christ clothed Peter and that they are *irreformabiles ex sese, non autem ex consensu ecclesiae*, that is: They are by their own innate dignity above being amended and do not derive their authority from the consent of the Church. The dogma, then, has been concocted in the papal councils simply as a final support for the fictitious claim, which neither sound exegesis nor history support, namely, that Christ conferred on Peter and his successors the primacy in His Church and therewith the *magisterium fidei*, the overlordship, or dictatorship, over men's faith.

There is not even the faintest vestige of such a claim being asserted by Peter himself or of being allowed by his brother apostles and fellow Christians. Therefore this preposterous claim must be rejected as a *principium cognoscendi* in theology. It is unscriptural, anti-Scriptural, and a tyrannical presumption in the Church of Jesus Christ.

We could make our investigation of false *principia cognoscendi* in theology more detailed, but the result would be the same: it would confirm over and over again our believing conviction that there can be neither supplement nor substitute for what God has had holy men of old, who spake as His Spirit moved them, write down for our guidance in religious matters and sealed as His final revelation by the messages of His Son on earth. That — the teaching of Jesus — puts the stamp of finality on, and concludes, our *principium cognoscendi* in theology.

Our Norwegian brethren very appropriately adopted for their synodical seal the inscription "It is written!" Our own Synod chose the device: *Verbum Dei manet in aeternum*, "the Word of God abideth forever." Concordia Seminary still sticks to its old motto *Anothen to phos*, "our light comes from above." And our young university venture at Valparaiso the late President Pieper of this school helped launch with a slogan from Ps. 36:9, *In luce tua videmus lucem*, "In Thy light shall we see light."

One of the early Protestant churches selected for its church seal the picture of a sturdy anvil, firmly anchored in the ground, around which lay scattered a multitude of broken hammers, big and small, with the inscription underneath: "The hammers are broken, the anvil still stands." The anvil represented the Word of God, the wrecked hammers the attempts to destroy it.

J. F. v. Meyer wrote, and Dr. Adolf Spaeth, of the former General Council, republished in his *Liederlust*, p. 119, this:

Es steht im Meer ein Felsen,
Die Wellen kreisen herum;
Die Wellen brausen am Felsen,
Doch faellt der Fels nicht um.

(Again I appeal to Concordia's poets for a proper rendition.) The Scriptures are what England's Prime Minister William Gladstone called them, an "impregnable rock," like the Eddystone Lighthouse in the English Channel. In the mad onrush of the waves that hurl themselves against it with the whole force of the Atlantic behind them, with their deafening roar and thunder in the cavernous rock and the furious spray driven over its top, it stands unmovable and casts its light calmly on the hurly-burly of the unresting sea at its base. So stands the eternal Word of God, rugged and firm, amidst the turbulent sea of human unrest.

Berkeley, Calif.

W. H. T. DAU

Luther: A Blessing to the English

VI. Lutheran Progress

John Skelton, poet-laureate of Oxford, Cambridge, and Louvain, whom Erasmus called "a light and ornament of British literature" and poet-laureate Southey also praised fabulously, was the most popular and audacious writer of his day. Tutor to Henry VIII, he scored the wicked courtiers. Cleric, he castigated the clergy. "Bestiall and untaught men," not able to read or spell their own names, they appoint as priests, preferring habitual drunkards that lead disorderly lives to worthy candidates. The theologians with a "lytell ragge of rhetoricke, a lesse lump of logicke, a patch of philosophy, tumbled in theology, were drowned in dregges of divinite, posing as doctoures of the chayre at the taverns." His "Colin Clout" blames all the woes of England on the clergy and mentions

Some have smacke
Of Luther's sacke,
And a brennyng sparke
Of Luther's warke.

The powerful Wolsey is "a malyncoly mastyf and mangye curre dog." In "Why come ye nat to courte?" he prays

God save his noble grace,
And grant him a place
Endless to dwell
With the devil in Hell!
For I undertake
He would so brag and crack
That he would then make
The devil to quake!

Roy's *Satire* says of the clergy —

Make the company great or small,
Among a thousand find thou shall
Scant one chaste of body or mind.

Joanna Leman would not take the blessed bread from her "Horsyn preste."

Maria da Pozo wrote Francis Spinelli from Rome, January 9, 1524: It is said the pope will make him [Luther] cardinal to quiet him, provided he choose to accept the grade. These Lutheran affairs harass the pope. Believes this will be the deluge of the Church.

Bishop Gian Matteo Giberti of Verona late in April wrote Melchior Lang, the nuncio in England: "Lutheranism is increasing, to the peril of Christendom. . . . If simple remedies will not suffice, the emperor should use fire and sword. . . . The pope expects great results from the king's help, considering the recent efforts of the cardinal of York to prevent this horrible plague from planting its foot in his kingdom. The king has gained great honor by being

the first to oppose this monster. The pope is the pilot of the ship, which will perish with him if his warnings be not regarded."

On May 9 John Clerk and Thomas Hannibal write Wolsey Campeggi wished him to make some demonstration against Lutheranism in London and to threaten "the hedds of Steeds and of that fellowship in London" (Hanse merchants) with the loss of their privileges unless they root out this heresy from their cities.

Bishop John Longland of Lincoln on January 5, 1525, wrote Wolsey about Wolsey's proposal for making a secret search in several places at once; and that Wolsey would be at the (St. Paul's) Cross with the clergy and have a notable clerk to preach against Luther and those who brought Lutheran books into England; after which, proclamation should be made for all who possessed copies to bring them in by a certain day, on which sentence of excommunication should be fulminated against all who disobeyed and those convicted compelled to abjure or be burned. All merchants and stationers are to be bound not to bring them in. The king is as good and gracious in this quarrel of God as could be . . . as fervent in this cause of Christ, His Church, and maintenance of the same, as ever a noble prince was. . . . The world is marvelously bent against the faith, and it is the King's grace and you that must remedy the same.

On January 16 Wolsey wrote John Clerk, now bishop of Bath: "Now that the Lutheran sect is so rapidly spreading through Germany, France, Spain, Flanders, Denmark, Scotland, and perhaps England, the pope should try to check it by some act tending to the reformation of enormity, and the observance of Christ's laws, or else it is hard to know how much the malice of the ghostly enemy might work or have power in them. . . . The Lutheran heresy makes it necessary to act wisely and speedily, lest Germany be estranged from the Church and the evil example do much harm in England."

In 1525 the kings of England and France made a treaty against the Turk and "the Lutheran sect, hardly less dangerous than the Turk."

In 1525 John Bugenhagen, usually called Pomeranus, sent a letter to the faithful Christians in England. John Bale, the future bishop of Ossory, gave it in English. "A compendious letter which Jhon Pomerane of Wittenberge sent to the faithful cristen congregation in England."

More replied to Bugenhagen: "They fight against faith and deny Christ, who, while they extol only grace and faith, deny the value of works, and make men callous to living well. . . . "Do you contend that it is false to say that your faction has wasted Germany by tumult, slaughter, and rapine? Do you dare call those liars

who affirm that your doctrine is the cause of it all?" — the Anabaptist insurrection and the Peasants' War. Later he even blames Luther for the kaiser's sack of Rome in 1527.

On September 21 Wolsey wrote the king from Boulogne: "The princes may elect a new king of the Romans, or else a new emperor, for repressing Luther, and bringing Germany into a better order and obedience."

"Hamilton was the first man after the erection of the university who put forth a series of theses to be publicly defended. These theses were conceived in the most evangelical spirit and were maintained with great learning. It was by my advice that he published them," says Francis Lambert of Avignon, the first French monk to be converted by Luther's writings and the first president of Marburg in Hessen, the first Protestant university.

Hamilton's theses are based on Luther's *Freedom of a Christian Man*.

Bishop John Leslie says Hamilton was filled "with venom very poisonable and deadly . . . soaked out of Luther and other arch-heretics." In prison he converted Canon Alexander Alane, whom Melancthon called Alesius, Wanderer. Hamilton was burned early in 1528. His theses were translated by John Frith and embodied by John Knox and John Fox, and so *Patrick's Places* became a cornerstone of Protestant theology both in Scotland and in England.

On May 11, 1528, the following were examined. Thomas Hemsted, who confessed his wife, Joan, had taught him the Lord's Prayer and the Apostles' Creed in English, which she had learned from Gilbert, a shipwright; William Bocher, Robert Hemsted, John and Edmund Tyball, Robert Faire, John Chapman, Thomas Hilles, William Browne, John Craneford, and the friars Gardyner, John Wyggen, Thomas Topley, and William Gardyner.

Humphrey Monmouth, a wealthy cloth merchant, who lived near the Tower, went to Rome and got an indulgence from guilt and punishment, and made a pilgrimage to the Holy Land. "When Luther's doctrine came first into England, Monmouth was an embracer of it." He bought and studied Luther's works and "had all the marks of a Scripture man." He heard Tyndale preach, was impressed, and took the needy scholar into his home. Here Tyndale read Luther, and now "Luther occupied the highest place in his esteem and exercised very considerable influence over his opinions."

On May 14, 1528, Sir Thomas More searched Monmouth's house and ministered articles against him.

1. That he knew that Luther and his opinions were condemned as heretical, and that his books were prohibited in England, in April, 1521.

2. That he has bought and kept many books by Luther and his sect.

3. That he has helped and given exhibition to persons occupied in translating the Bible, and making erroneous books from it; as Sir William Hochin *alias* Tyndalle, priest, and friar Roye, an apostate Observant.

4. That he helped Tyndalle and Roye to go to Almayne to study Luther's sect.

5. That he had books of Luther's translated into English, as well as his book *De Libertate Christiana*, and his exposition upon the Pater Noster.

6. That the *De Libertate Christiana* was written in the beginning and drawn out of St. Augustine's works, and the exposition of the Pater Noster ascribed to Hilarius, to blind and abuse the readers.

7. That he has helped the translation of the New Testament by Tyndal and Roye, as well as its printing and importation.

8. That he has read and kept the translation after it was openly forbidden as being full of errors.

9. That he has kept and read an English introduction to St. Paul's Epistle to the Romans.

10. That other books, full of errors, translated into English, have been sent to him by Tyndalle.

11. That he has been privy to the printing beyond sea, of detestable English books against the sacrament of the Altar, the Mass, and other observances of the Church.

12. That he has caused books by Luther and friar Lambert to be translated into English.

13. That he has eaten flesh in Lent.

14. That he has said and believed that faith without works is sufficient to save a man's soul.

15. That all men are not bound to observe the constitutions of the Church.

16. That we should pray to God, and not to Saints.

17. That Christians are to worship God only, and not Saints.

18. That pilgrimages should not be used.

19. That men should not offer to images in Church, nor set lights before them.

20. That contrition and confession to God alone are sufficient for a man in deadly sin.

21. That no man is bound to keep fast days.

22. That pardons granted by the Pope or a bishop are not profitable.

23. That he is considered an advancer and favorer of Luther and his heresies.

24. That the above is true and notorious, and commonly reported in London and elsewhere.

He was flung into prison.

On June 4, 1528, Tayler writes Wolsey about John Corbett, one of his servants, well learned both in Greek and Latin, in good letters he has wonderful felicity and capacity and insuperable diligence. He had to "take a pen and paper, and write his mind with his own hand, as far as he knoweth himself infect in Luther's opinions, and by whom he was moved and what companions or favorites he hath had or hath, adherents to the said Luther's heresies." Hopes Wolsey will have compassion of [his young] age.

Next day Tayler writes that at midnight Corbette rose, "saying he went *ad opus naturae*." "The cecesse was without the chamber." As he returned not, his fellows sought for him, but he could not be found. Has sent to Paris and Roan in search of him. Hopes he shall be excused for his facile credence.

On June 5, 1528, Sir Robert Winfield writes the bishop of Bath by Wolsey's command has taken certain of Martin Luther's scholars at Paris, who have accused a priest of this town [Calais], named Philip Smyth, otherwise Fabry. The priest's chamber was well furnished with books, 12 or more of Luther's or his favorers; all of which he put into a pillowbere and sealed, and committed the priest to Wolsey's commissary. The priest had Luther on Peter, Jude, the Galatians, and *De pseudo-Epistolis*. Francis Lambert on the 12 Minor Prophets, *De causa*, &c., and his Paradoxes. Melancthon on St. Paul to the Romans and to the Corinthians, and on the Gospel of St. John. The Psalter of Pomeranius. John Oecolampadius on Isaiah. The New Testament of Erasmus, his *De Libero Arbitrio*; the two parts of his *Hyperaspistes* against Luther.

He had these books two years and a half. Thinks Luther should not be condemned except by a General Council.

Francis Dynamis [Strong?] on June 19, 1528, confesses to Wolsey a previous acquaintance with George Constantine, Simon Fish, Thomas Bilney, and others, whom he abhors as pestiferous followers of Luther, at whose suggestion he had translated into English the first book of Francis Lambert "*De Causis excaecationis multorum seculorum*," and a letter which Bugenhagen sent "To the Faithful in Anglia." He had visited Paris and spent ten months in Constantine's house, where he had bought Luther's works and others, and the New Testament in English, with an "Introduction to the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans," etc.

But being taken and committed to prison, these books were

found among his effects, and he was brought before the English ambassador at St. Germain's, Bishop Clerk of Bath. He ends by bespeaking the usual clemency of the cardinal.

Friars William Roy and Jerome Barlow at Strassburg printed *Rede me and be not wrothe*, based on Niclas Manuel's famous *Krankheit der Messe*, a violent attack on the English clergy and especially Wolsey.

A dialog of Wolfgang Resch was translated by Walter Lynne under the name of *Dialog of Two Sisters*.

Cardinal Wolsey feasted his eyes on a play which was a satire on Luther, likely some connection with John Hasenberg's *Ludus ludentem Luderum ludens*.

On July 28 Richard Harman writes the kaiser he has been put in prison by the margrave of Amsterdam for selling English New Testaments to a merchant out of England and for harboring Lutherans in his house.

Tyndale published *The obedience of a Christen man and how Christen rulers ought to governe*. . . . At Marlborow in the lande of Hesse. The seconde daye of October. Anno MCCCCC. xxviiij by me Hans luft."

"So thoroughly Lutheran in its thought that it reads like a translation of the reformer's own words," says Preserved Smith. The king cried out: "This book is for me and all kings to read!" Strype declares it made Henry shake off the rule of the Pope.

On October 15, 1528, an unknown heretic confessed about four years ago Joan, daughter of one Dyer of Tynchenfeld, taught him the 1st chapter of James. One Quynntyne, butcher, taught him the 2nd chapter of James. John Tyball read Paul's Epistles and the Evangelists to him. Went with Sir Richard Fox, John Tyball, John Smyth, friars Topley and Gardyner, to the house of one Gilbert, shipwright, where they read the New Testament and talked of heresies. They also met at Bowre Hall, Mother Bocher's, and Mother Charte's, where sometimes Fox, or the respondent, or John Smyth, would read the New Testament in English, in presence of them and their households. About a year ago last Whitsuntide, being in London with John Tyball, went to friar Barnes at the Friars Augustines, to buy New Testaments. Found him reading the New Testament to a young gentleman, with a chain round his neck. Each of them bought a New Testament for 3s. Read it in the houses of Roger, a tanner, Gyfford, Bower Hall, Mother Bocher's, and Mother Charte's, and at last sold it to Fox.

Dr. Philip Faber [Smith] after December, 1528, thanks Wolsey for absolving him from his errors at the intercession of Cardinal Campeggi for holding heretical communications with one Dynamis, who had come to Calais two or three years ago. When he said

he followed Lyranus, Dynamis facetiously replied, "Forget the delirium of Lyra, and take this new preacher of the Gospel," giving him Luther's *Abrogation of the Mass, Exposition of Daniel's Vision, The Eighth of Daniel*; which he had not seen before. He also received from him three books which Dynamis had bought at Antwerp, viz., Melanchthon on Romans, Matthew, and Luther's *Unfree Will*. Melanchthon on John and Corinthians, with Francis Lambert on the *Rule of the Minorites*, he had resold to James Yates; and some other volumes in English and German, which he had copied out with his own hand.

"The play called the foure PP. A newe and a very mery enterlude of A palmer, A pardoner, A potecary, A pedler. Made by John Heewood" [Heywood] came out about 1528. Froude says it is full of Lutheran doctrine, but we find in it only a satire of the corrupt condition of the church.

"This was still the age of blasphemous and saturnalian parody, when feasts of the ass, the bull, and the Innocents were celebrated before cathedral altars."

Cardinal Campeggi, credited with five bastards, found the royal rascal reading Luther's books. On April 3, 1529, he wrote: "I told the king this was the devil dressed in angel's garb in order that he might the more easily deceive. I represented that by Councils and theologians it had been determined that the Church justly held her temporal goods.

"His Majesty remarked the Lutherans say these decisions were arrived at by theologians, insinuating it was now necessary for the laity to interpose. Then he attacked the wickedness of the papal court."

It seems the leaven of Luther's *Address to the Nobility of the German Nation* was now leavening the lump of the head of the English nation.

In 1525 Simon Fish, a lawyer of Gray's Inn, in a play acted the part of Cardinal Wolsey and then fled over the sea to Tyndale. About 1529 he wrote *A Supplicacyon for the Beggars to the King oure Souereygne lorde*."

"For verey constreint they die for hunger . . . by the reason and [that] there is . . . craftily crept ynto this your realme an other sort (not of impotent, but) of strong, puissaunt, and counterfeit holy, and ydell, beggers and vacabundes, whiche . . . are nowe encreased vnder your sight, not onely into a great nombre, but also ynto a kingdome. These are (not the herdes, but the rauinous wolues going in herdes clothing, deuouring the flocke) the Bishoppes, Abbottes, Priours, Deacons, Archedeacons, Suffraganes, Prestes, Monkes, Chanons, Freres, Pardoners and Somners. And who is abill to nombre this idell, rauinous sort, whiche (setting

all labours a side) haue begged so importunately that they haue gotten ynto theyre hondes more then the therd part of all youre Realme."

Five orders take 20 pence a year from every house, or in round numbers 43,333 pounds, 6 shillings, 8 pence.

"England stoud tributary vnto a cruell, deuellisshe bloudsupper, dronken in the bloude of the sayntes and marters of Christ. . . .

"The haue to do with euery mannes wife, euery mannes doughter, and euery mannes mayde, that cuckkoldrie and baudrie shulde reigne ouer all emong your subjects, that noman shulde knowe his owne childe. . . .

"These be they that haue made an hundreth thousand ydell hores yn your realme. These be they that corrupt the hole generation of mankind in your realme; that catche the pokkes of one woman, and bere theym to an other; that be brent wyth one woman, and bere it to an other; that catche the lepry of one woman, and bere it to another; ye, some one of theym shall bost among his felawes, that he hath medled with an hundred wymen. . . .

"Where is youre swerde, power, crowne, and dignite become, that shulde punissh (by punisshement of deth, euen as other men are punisshed) the felonies, rapes, murders, and treasons committed by this sinful generacion? . . .

"Who is she that wil set her hondes to worke, to get .iiij.d. a day, and may haue at lest .xx.d. a day to slepe an houre with a frere, a monke, or a prest? What is he that wolde laboure for a grote a day, and may haue at lest .xij.d. a day to be baude to a prest, a monke, or a frere? Whate a sort are there of theime that mari prestes souereigne ladies, but to cloke the prestes yncontinency, and that they may haue a liuing of the prest theime silues for their labour? . . .

"Whate remedy: make lawes ageynst them? Are they not stronger in your owne parliament house then your silfe? . . .

"This is the great scabbe why they will not let the newe Testament go a-brode yn your moder tong, lest men shulde espie that they, by theyre cloked ypochrisi, do translate thus fast your kingdom into theyre hondes . . . that they are cruell, vnclene, vnmerciful, and ypochrites, that thei seke not the honour of Christ, but their owne, that the remission of sinnes are not giuen by the popes pardon, but by Christ, for the sure feith and trust that we haue in him. . . .

"Take from them all these thynges. . . . Then shall the gospell be preached. . . ."

A copy of this eloquent indictment came into the hands of Anne Boleyn, and through her the king got it and put it into his bosom.

Sir Thomas More tried to wipe out the deep impression made by Fish by writing the *Supplicacion of the poore sely soules pewling out of Purgatory*. The souls scoff at the author of the Beggars, "sometymes scoldyng and rayling at hym, callyng hym foole, witlesse, frantike, an asse, a goose, a madde dogge, an hereticke, and all that naught is." Such is the wit of England's greatest wit.

Parable of the Wicked Mammon appeared in 1529 — Tyndale's work on justification by faith, based on Luther. More calls it "a very treasury and well-spring of wickedness, a book by which many have been beguiled and brought into many wicked heresies."

An Exposition in to the seventh chaptre of the first pistle to the Corinthians. At Malborow in the londe of Hesse. MDXXIX .xx daye Junii. By me Hans Luft. Translated by Tyndale.

A Pistle to the Christen Reder. The Revelation of Antichrist. Antithesis wherein are compared togeder Christes actes and our holye father the Popes. [At Marl] borow in the land of Hesse. xij day of Julye Anno MCCCCxxix. Hans luft. — Luther's *Passional Christi et Antichristi* of 1521.

Tunstal helped make the Treaty of Cambray, ended on August 5, 1529, which embraced "the forbidding to print or sell any Lutheran books." While at Antwerp, he met Augustine Packyngton, a mercer and merchant of London, who offered to buy up all English New Testaments. "The Bishop, thinkyng that he had God by the too, when in deede he had (as after he thought) the Deville by the fiste, said, 'Gentle Master Packyngton, do your diligence and get them, and with all my harte I will paie for them, whatsoever thei cost you, for the bokes are erronious and naughte, and I entende surely to destroy theim all, and to burn them at Paule's Crosse. . . ."

"An so forward went the bargain. The Bishop had the bokes, Packyngton had the thankes, and Tyndale had the money."

Ever more New Testaments came into England, and so Tunstal asked Packington how that came. "It will never bee better as long as thei have the letters and stamps, therefore it were best for your lordshippe to bye the stampes to, and then are you sure."

The Bishop smiled at him and said: "Well, Packyngton, well," and so ended this matter.

Curate George Constantine of London helped Tyndale and Joy in translating the New Testament, passed and repassed the sea, taking the Testament and Luther's works to England, and was arrested and jailed.

Lord Chancellor More said: "Constantine, there is beyond the sea, Tyndale, Joye, and a greet many mo of you. I knowe thei cannot lyve without helpe, some sendeth them money and suc-

cowreth theim, and thyself beyng one of them, haddest parte thereof, and therefore knowest from whence it came. I praie thee who be thei that thus helpe them?"

"My Lorde, will you that I shal tell you the truthe?"

"Yea, I praie thee."

"Mary I will. Truly, it is the Bishoppe of London that hath holpen us, for he hath bestowed emong us a great deale of money in New Testamentes to burne theim, and that hath and yet is our only succoure and comfort."

"Now by my trothe, I thynke even the same, and I said so muche to the Bishop, when he went about to bye them."

Constantine betrayed his companions and the shipmen who brought in the books.

Henry ordered Wolsey to free the prior of Reading, in prison for Lutheranism, "unless the matter is very serious."

The Reichstag had time and again presented the famous Hundred grievances against the clergy, and on November 3, 1529, England followed the example. This Parliament is known as "The Parliament for the enormities of clergy." Bishop Burnet says the laymen were favorers of the Lutheran teaching in their hearts.

All the clergy could do was to cry "Heretics! Lack of faith!" Bishop John Fisher cried: "For God's sake, see what realm the kingdom of Boheme was, and when the church fell down, there fell the glory of the kingdom. Now with the Commons is nothing but 'Down with the church,' and all this meseemeth is for lack of faith only."

The saintly sage was forced to apologize, but "he stooped to an equivocation too transparent to deceive any one."

The bishops said: "In the crime of heresy, thanked be God, there hath no notable person fallen in our time. Truth it is that certain apostate friars and monks, lewd priests, bankrupt merchants, vagabonds and lewd idle fellows of corrupt nature, have embraced the abominable and erroneous opinions lately sprung up in Germany, and by them have been some seduced in simplicity and ignorance. Against these, if judgment have been exercised according to the laws of the realm, we be without blame. If we have been too remiss or slack, we shall gladly do our duty from henceforth."

They did — with a vengeance.

"By the procurement and sedition of Martin Luther and other heretics were slain an infinite number of Christian people" in Germany. That must not happen in England; and so, in 1529 the King issued "A Proclamation of resysting and withstanding of most dampnable Heresy,es, sown within this Realme by the Disciples of Martin Luther and other Heretykes, Perverters of Christes Re-

ligyon." He published an Index of Prohibited Books with the title: *Books of the Lutheran sect or faction imported into the city of London.*

"Dr. Martin Luther Concerning Good Works. Letter of Luther to Pope Leo X. Tassaradecas Consolatoria of Martin Luther. Tract of Luther Concerning Christian Liberty. Sermons of Dr. Martin Luther. Exposition of the Epistles of St. Peter by Martin Luther. Reply of Martin Luther to Bartholomew Catharinus. Of the Works of God by Martin Cellarius. Deuteronomy, from the Hebrew, with annotations of Martin Luther. Luther's Catechism in Latin by J. Lonicerus. The Prophet Jonah, explained by Martin Luther. Commentary of Martin Luther on the Epistle of Paul to the Galatians. Selection from the letters of Martin Luther, full of piety and learning, with the interpretations of several psalms. Narrations of Postils of Martin Luther upon the lessons from the Gospels, etc. Sixteen Conclusions of the reverend father, Martin Luther, concerning Faith and Ceremonies. Most Wholesome Declaration of the same concerning Faith and Works. Most Learned Explanation of Ceremonies. Fifty Conclusions by the same for timid consciences, Luther's Explanation of his thirteenth proposition Concerning the Power of the Pope. Oration of Didymus Faventinus [Melanchthon] on behalf of Martin Luther. New Narrations of Martin Luther on the prophet Jonah. Judgment of Martin Luther Concerning Monastic Vows. Enchiridion of Godly Prayers of Martin Luther. Several brief Sermons of Martin Luther on the Virgin, the Mother of God." Also works of Melanchthon, Bugenhagen, Brentz, Rhegius, Carlstadt, Agricola, Bucer, and others — all "books of the Lutheran sect."

More writes: "Although these books cannot either be there printed without great cost, nor here sold without great adventure and peril, yet with money sent hence, they cease not to print them there and send them hither by the whole sacks full at once, and in some places, looking for no lucre, cast them abroad at night; so great a pestilent pleasure have some devilish people caught with the labor, travail, cost, charge, peril, harm, and hurt of themselves to seek the destruction of others."

More wished Catholics were half so zealous "as those that are fallen into false heresies and have forsaken the faith, who seem to have a hot fire of hell in their hearts that can never suffer them to rest or cease, but forces them night and day to labor and work busily to subvert and destroy the Catholic Christian faith by every means they can devise."

Oak Park, Ill.

WILLIAM DALLMANN

(To be continued)

Henry Melchior Muehlenberg

An Appreciation

Dr. E. A. W. Krauss, in his *Lebensbilder*, calls Heinrich Melchior Muehlenberg the patriarch of the Lutheran Church in America. Dr. A. L. Graebner, in his *Geschichte der lutherischen Kirche in Amerika*, declares that he was the "greatest man whom God bestowed upon the American Lutheran Church of the 18th century." Dr. G. Fritschel, in his *Geschichte der lutherischen Kirche in Amerika*, writes of Muehlenberg: "So eng war er mit all ihren Interessen verbunden, so hervorragend erscheint er in allen ihren Teilen von Neu-Schottland (Nova Scotia) bis Georgia, dasz die Geschichte der Kirche seit seiner Landung 1742 bis zu seinem Tode zu Trappe am 7. Oktober 1787 kaum mehr ist als seine Biographie." Those are high tributes indeed!

In order to evaluate the services of this man, who is to this day held in high esteem in all branches of the Lutheran Church in America, the 200th anniversary of whose coming to America is being remembered this year, it will be necessary to sketch in broad outline the chief facts of his very full and active life.

Muehlenberg first saw the light of day at a time when George Washington, whose senior contemporary he was to be, had not yet been born; five years after the first collection of Isaac Watts' hymns was published; five years after the first Lutheran missionaries, Ziegenbalg and Pluetschau, went to India; ten years before Hans Egede sailed on his famous missionary journey to Greenland; when our country, our United States of America, was not even dreamed of; when the English colonies on our soil were small and struggling; and when Lutheranism in America was represented by a few scattered groups of different nationalities and various background, unconnected, disorganized, and in no way conscious of the great future which our Church was destined to find on this continent.

Muehlenberg was born at Eimbeck in Hanover on Sept. 6, 1711, one hundred years before the birth of Carl Ferdinand Wilhelm Walther. His family, once well to do and prominent, had become impoverished. He was a gifted boy and from childhood seems to have had the ministry in mind. As a boy, probably not over twelve, he showed the serious bent of his nature in a poem which he inscribed on a blank page in the family Bible. Referring to the account of the healing of the man with a withered hand (Matt. 12:10-13), he wrote in German:

Two hands, both fresh and strong, did my Creator give;
They shall not idle be as long as I may live;
First I will raise them up to God to praise and pray,
And then they may begin what labors brings each day.
In truth, I never will forget the *Ora*,
And with it, hand in hand, I'll practice the *Labora*.

"Certainly, this is satisfactory evidence that the youth intelligently appropriated and applied the Word of God as he read it or was instructed in it." (Mann, *Biography of Henry Melchior Muehlenberg*.)

The evident gifts of the son encouraged the father to plan for his higher education, but the latter's early death forced the son to take up manual labor instead in order to help support the family. His spare time, however, was devoted to study and music (he learned to play both the organ and the clavichord), and when he reached the age of twenty-one, he took up the study of Latin and then of Greek. At 24, when he entered the newly founded University of Goettingen, a step made possible by the financial aid of the city of Eimbeck and some friends, he read the Latin classics fluently and could understand the Greek of the New Testament. It was characteristic that already during his university days he became interested in the temporal and spiritual welfare of some beggar children, instructing them and otherwise looking after their needs.

Upon graduating from Goettingen, he went to Jena for a short period and then taught a year at the famous Halle Orphanage, where at first he had a class of small boys. Later it was also made his duty, "in the higher classes of those extensive institutions, to give instruction in Greek, Hebrew, and in some theological branches, and he was appointed 'inspector' of a ward of the sick, which office . . . gave him opportunity to acquire some knowledge of the medical art, which he had ample occasion to make good use of in the future years of his life." (Mann, pp. 12 and 13.)

It must be borne in mind that the Halle institutions were at this time the headquarters of the Lutheran Danish-Halle missions in India, besides being a center for eleemosynary work in Germany generally. These activities brought the fathers of Halle into correspondence with godly men in various countries, for instance, with the German court preacher at London, the Rev. F. M. Ziegenhagen, D.D., who there became a fatherly friend and adviser to many missionaries sent out by Halle. Ziegenbalg and Pluetschau had spent some time in Halle before going to India. Christian Frederick Schwartz, the most successful of all German missionaries of the 18th century, was to come forth out of these institutions a little later. August Herman Francke, the world-renowned founder of the Halle institutions, had died in 1727. At this time his son,

Gotthilf August Francke, was the directing head. Gotthilf August Francke and his co-workers readily recognized the outstanding abilities of young Muehlenberg and hoped to send him to India to establish a new mission in Bengal, but "outward circumstances prevented the execution of the plan." And so after a year at Halle the young candidate entered upon a pastoral charge at Grosshennersdorf in Upper Lusatia (Silesia) where he served from 1739 to 1741.

It was on Muehlenberg's birthday in 1741, when he was thirty years old, having been invited to the home of G. A. Francke, that the latter handed him the call from the congregations in Philadelphia, Providence, and New Hanover in the English Colony of Pennsylvania. This call stipulated that he serve these congregations and the scattered Lutherans in Pennsylvania. Dr. Francke suggested, "zur Probe auf drei Jahre." Muehlenberg replied at once that he would go if it be the will of God. And Mrs. Francke was so overjoyed that she made him a present of a dressing gown, which she had made with her own hands.

It might be inserted here that this call from Pennsylvania went begging for a man for almost seven years, and it is somewhat difficult to get a clear picture of the conditions that prevailed in those days to explain why it should take so long to find a man who would be willing to go to America as pastor of three congregations. As early as 1734 the Rev. J. C. Schultze, the first German Lutheran pastor in Philadelphia, had been commissioned together with two laymen to go to Europe and obtain men and money for the support of the churches in Eastern Pennsylvania. Schultze never returned to America, and the two laymen came back after about a year without having received any definite assurance from the church authorities. Meanwhile the three congregations were being served more or less haphazardly by other "Lutheran" pastors in the vicinity, and their officials were corresponding with Ziegenhagen in London and the Halle fathers. It seems that the leaders at Halle were insistent upon some sort of guarantee that the man who would be sent would be properly supported by the congregations, and the officials of the congregations maintained that they did not want a man whose main interest was a large salary, but that he should be ready and willing to come and serve them; they on their part would take care of him in a suitable manner. In justice to the Halle fathers it must be said that they did not demand a high salary, and the congregations, described in the call as being composed of 500 families each, were certainly able to meet their modest demand. At any rate, matters dragged along from year to year until 1741, and when Muehlenberg received the call and was commissioned, the congregations were not made aware of it and did not obtain

that information until Muehlenberg suddenly appeared in their midst! It is also possible that G. A. Francke would not have submitted the call to Muehlenberg at this particular time if he had not learned that Graf Ludwig von Zinzendorf was in Philadelphia, actively endeavoring to win the Lutheran congregations for his Moravian Church.

It is interesting to read a sectarian judgment on this matter. Leonard Woolsey Bacon, in his *History of American Christianity*, writes:

"At once the 'drum ecclesiastic' beat to arms. In view of the impending danger that their scattered fellow countrymen might come into mutual fellowship on the basis of their common faith in Christ, the Lutheran leaders at Halle, who for years had been dawdling and haggling over the imploring entreaties of the shepherdless Lutheran populations in America, promptly reconsidered their *non possumus* and found and sent a man admirably qualified for the desired work, Henry Melchior Muehlenberg, a man of eminent ability and judgment, of faith, devotion, and untiring diligence, not illiberal, but a conscientious sectarian."

At the suggestion of Dr. Ziegenhagen in London, whither Muehlenberg went to receive the actual call and further instructions regarding it, he was to go to Philadelphia via the Salzburger colony in Georgia in order that Rev. J. M. Boltzius, the main leader of that group, might accompany him to Philadelphia and assist him in becoming established there. Muehlenberg sailed for Georgia on June 13, 1742, and after a voyage of over one hundred days landed at Charleston, S. C., and proceeded to Savannah from there. His visit among the Salzburgers was a refreshing experience for him. Boltzius was willing to accompany him to Philadelphia and journeyed as far as Charleston with him, but unforeseen delays prevented him from going farther. Muehlenberg finally proceeded to Philadelphia alone on a single-masted sloop and had a rather stormy voyage. It was characteristic of him that during his stay at Charleston, as well as on his voyage across the Atlantic, he took every opportunity to minister to the German Lutherans he met. He finally arrived at Philadelphia on Nov. 25, 1742. Five months and twelve days had elapsed since he left England.

There was no reception committee awaiting him at Philadelphia, no congregation anxiously looking for its new pastor, no one even aware of his coming; nothing but confusion as far as the congregational matters were concerned. Some of the people had accepted Zinzendorf as leader; others had gathered around a vagabond preacher named Kraft. At New Hanover, 36 miles northwest of Philadelphia, an unfinished log house was used as a church, and that congregation was divided over another tramp-

preacher, an ex-druggist, named Schmid. At Providence, Kraft was also in charge. Here was a critical situation, that called for a large measure of good judgment and tactfulness.

In this maze of confusion, in which he found himself, although only 32 years old, he exhibited such fine qualities and good sense, sober-mindedness, judgment, and tact that he fully confirmed the confidence which the fathers in Halle had reposed in him by giving him the call to these churches. In the *Hallesche Nachrichten*, we have his own story of his arrival in Philadelphia and the subsequent events, and it is intensely refreshing to read the account.

Valentine Kraft, it seems, at once recognized Muehlenberg's right to the congregation but tried his best to retain his own position in Philadelphia and to turn the country churches over to the new man. He traveled with him into the field and sought to persuade Muehlenberg to be content with one of the country places; but Muehlenberg carefully listened to him, took an insight into affairs at each place, and met Kraft's suggestions with silence. Again and again we read his somewhat laconic statement: "Ich lies es beruhen bis auf weitere Einsicht." "Ich schwieg stille bis auf weitere Einsicht."

His quiet demeanor, his firm stand on his call, his sincere interest in the people, made an impression on the leaders among the laity, and gradually the members rallied to his side. Finally, at a meeting called to settle Muehlenberg's right as pastor and the validity of his call, in which Count Zinzendorf was chairman and in which Muehlenberg was treated in a most humiliating manner, he was able to carry the day. Zinzendorf had to give up in defeat and soon afterwards returned to Germany. Kraft and Schmid also receded. Muehlenberg was accepted as pastor by his flocks.

Bacon's view of the matter as given in his *History of American Christianity* is colored by his antipathy to confessionalism:

"At the time of Muehlenberg's arrival, Zinzendorf was the elected and installed pastor of the Lutheran congregation in Philadelphia. The conflict could not be a long one between the man who claimed everything for his commission and his sect and the man who was resolved to insist on nothing for himself. Notwithstanding the strong love for him among the people, Zinzendorf was easily displaced from his official station. When dispute arose about the use of the empty carpenter's shop which they used for a church, he waived his own claims and at his own cost built a new house of worship. But it was no part of his work to stay and persist in maintaining a division. He retired from the field, leaving it in charge of Muehlenberg, 'being satisfied if only Christ

were preached,' and returned to Europe, having achieved a truly honorable and most Christian failure, more to be esteemed in the sight of God than many a splendid success."

If ever a man had reasons to be disheartened with conditions, it was Muehlenberg. His battle was by no means over after Zinzendorf left, for the years that followed were years to try the soul of the strongest Christian. The self-sacrificing diligence of the man, his great love for the souls in his charge and for others languishing for want of spiritual care, are evident on every page of his reports. He set an example for the Church that was needed and that helped to plant the Church on American soil. He had true zeal but was not a *Schwaermer*. His training, though strongly pietistic, had been according to true Lutheran principles. He worked to build up his congregations. He established a school for the children in each and was insistent upon careful indoctrination.

The poverty he met with was extreme. His home in Philadelphia was a lean-to of the home of a member, so small that he remarks it was a little roomier than the famous "cask of Diogenes" and gave him sufficient space to study and sleep, but not to walk around in. His salary, to start with, was nothing per month. He supported himself for a time by giving music lessons on the side. One congregation contributed a horse for his trips back and forth, another paid his rent, the third contributed nothing. But he stuck to his post. Things improved in the course of time.

The news that the congregations in and near Philadelphia had received a worthy man as their pastor quickly spread abroad. Soon Muehlenberg was besieged with requests for spiritual services from all sides. Wherever he could be of assistance, he gave it freely, teaching, baptizing, confirming, preaching, settling disputes, advising, building, administering the Sacraments to the living and to the dying. He journeyed hither and thither over almost impassable roads and trails, in winter and summer, and was often in danger of life and limb. Some of the places which he visited again and again are historic in the annals of the Lutheran Church: Tulpehocken, Frederick, York, Chester, Reading, etc. To these churches, many of which had suffered at the hands of clerical vagabonds, his coming was like life from the dead. He reconciled jarring factions, encouraged formal organization, and brought the frontier churches into vital relations with the eastern parishes and with the mother church in Europe. He was able to imbue pastors and people with a Lutheran consciousness that was extremely necessary.

One of the far-reaching results of his tireless activity was the organization of the Pennsylvania Ministerium, the first permanent Lutheran Synod in America, which took place on August 26, 1748.

This was the greatest step forward in the planting of the Church in America. Dr. A. L. Graebner calls it "the most important event in the history of the American Lutheran Church of the 18th century."

One of the important matters before this synod was the acceptance of a proper liturgical service order. The common liturgy prepared by Muehlenberg and his co-workers was examined and adopted. It was a fairly good Lutheran liturgy and essentially the Common Service of today.

Liturgy

1. Opening Hymn. 2. Confession. 3. Kyrie. 4. Gloria in Excelsis ("Allein Gott in der Hoeh' sei Ehr'"). 5. Salutation and Response. 6. Collect. 7. Epistle. 8. Hymn. 9. Gospel. 10. Credo. 11. Hymn. 12. Sermon. 13. General Prayer. 14. Announcements. 15. Offertory. 16. Salutation. 17. Collect. 18. Benediction. 19. Closing Hymn.

B. M. Schmucker, who was in his day one of the most learned liturgiologists of our country, said of the Muehlenberg liturgy:

"It is the old, well-defined, conservative service of the Saxon and North German liturgies. It is, indeed, the pure, Biblical parts of the service of the Western Church for a period of a thousand years before the Reformation, with the modifications given it by the Saxon Reformers." (*Memoirs*, p. 88, Vol. IV.)

Though this liturgy was copied by pastors, but never published, it was used for 38 years. When publication was ordered by the Pennsylvania Ministerium in 1786, it was much altered.

During the following years the extent of Muehlenberg's activity increased greatly. Troubles in the churches of New York called for a peacemaker. He visited various congregations on the Hudson and preached in New York City. He was so impressed with the need in that city that he allowed himself to be prevailed upon to spend six months there in the summer of 1751 and three months in 1752. He had to preach Dutch, English, and German every Sunday, but he brought unity to the distracted congregations. Till 1761 he was active again in Pennsylvania (New Hanover, etc.) and in that year returned to Philadelphia to quell the troubled waters that threatened the church there.

In 1762 a congregational constitution was prepared by Muehlenberg for St. Michael's Church in Philadelphia. In it he embodied his rich experiences in pastoral work among the German, Dutch, and Swedish Lutherans. This constitution was long used by ministers who organized churches in Pennsylvania and the neighboring states. It also served as a foundation for the congregational constitution of the General Synod later and was thus the basis for the congregational constitution of practically all synods until 1840.

In it the pastors were pledged to the Unaltered Augsburg Confession, to strict discipline, and to the founding of parish schools. In the election of pastors, regulations were made for holding "Probepredigten." A pastor could be called with the consent of two thirds of the communicant membership and two thirds of the "Kirchenrath."

The instruction of catechumens was also carefully regulated. It was to be a thorough course in the fundamentals of the faith. There must be a public examination. Fourteen years was the minimum age of confirmation. The "Pruefung" should be "mehr zur Aufmunterung und Besserung der Gemeinde, als zu zeigen, wie viel Muehe der Lehrer bei der Arbeit angewandt habe; mehr wie der Verstand der Jugend erleuchtet und ihr Herz gebessert sei, als wie sehr sie ihr Gedaechnisz angefuellt haben." The examination was to be limited in time to one and one half hours. (A. L. Graebner gives the confirmation pledge, p. 597.)

The pastors were held to keep a register of all communicants and by means of "Beichtanmeldung" to exercise discipline. On the day before Communion a preparatory service was conducted.

In the troubled times leading up to the Revolutionary War it seems that internal congregational strife was the order of the day, and everywhere Muehlenberg's strong hand was sought for relief. In 1774 he went to Charleston, where he successfully settled congregational difficulties, and thence to Ebenezer, where by request of the authorities in Europe he was to repair the damage done by Triebner.

In 1779 the correspondence with Halle was broken off on account of the war, but the work had been done to plant the Lutheran Church in America, so that the shock of the war and the severing of relations with Halle did not seriously affect its life. Muehlenberg died Oct. 7, 1787, 76 years old, respected and beloved by the people for whom he had labored long and patiently. His work had been done. Congregations had been properly organized and somewhat united by synodical ties. With all the imperfections of the work which had been accomplished, it is still an abiding monument to the genius and labors of the man who was "the greatest man whom God had given to the Lutheran Church of America in the 18th century," "the patriarch and father of the American Lutheran Church."

As far as Muehlenberg's personal Lutheranism was concerned, there can be no question as to his sincerity in his devotion to the Confessions of the Church, actualized by a noble, exemplary life and service. To those who tried to detract from his position, he stated: "I ask Satan and all his lying spirits to prove anything against me which is not in harmony with the teachings of the

apostles or of our Symbolical Books. I have stated frequently that there is neither fault nor error nor any kind of defect in our evangelical doctrines, founded on the teachings of the prophets and the apostles, and set forth in our Symbolical Books."

On another occasion (June 14, 1774, in a letter to the Charleston Church) he stated: "During the 32 years of my sojourning in America, time and again occasions were given me to join the Episcopal Church and to receive four or five times more salary than my poor German fellow members of the Lutheran faith gave me; but I preferred reproach in and with my people to the treasures in Egypt." (Bente, *American Lutheranism*, I, p. 71.)

The same is true of Muehlenberg's colleague, Brunnholtz, for instance, who stated: "I, Peter Brunnholtz, do solemnly swear and before God Almighty do take an oath upon my soul . . . that I will abide by the pure doctrine and unadulterated Word of God . . . and the true Lutheran Church books . . . and that I will teach according to them."

All pastors of the synod were pledged to the Confessions. In the congregational constitutions the congregations were pledged to the Symbolical Books, and the pastors were pledged to preach "the Word of God according to the foundation of the apostles and prophets and in conformity with the Unaltered Augsburg Confession."

Though the synod organized by Muehlenberg had no regular constitution during the first years, yet in the Agenda, prepared and distributed in manuscript, it was regarded as self-evident that all pastors and congregations subscribe to the Lutheran Symbols. The same Agenda asks at confirmation of the catechumens: "Do you intend to remain true to the truth of the Evangelical Lutheran Church as you have learned to know it and solemnly confessed it?"

In the synodical constitution of 1778 the following paragraph covered this point: "As to his life and teaching every pastor is to be found in consonance with the Word of God and our Symbolical Books of faith." (Bente, I, p. 72.)

The pietism of Halle was also the pietism of Muehlenberg. Only those who had passed through a spiritual awakening were regarded as truly converted children of God. The result was that Muehlenberg and his co-workers frequently judged congregations and individuals unduly when they did not see all the outward marks of piety they looked for. He advocated private prayer meetings for the awakening of those who were still in the sleep of sin, and that did not mean unbelievers, but baptized and confirmed members of the churches in most instances. The result was that revivals, or meetings of a similar nature, were held, and later when the fire of revivalism swept sections of the country, the

Lutheran churches frequently took part, introduced the mourners' bench, protracted meetings, emotional preaching, and Methodist revival hymns, etc.

Hierarchical tendencies are seen in the fact that under the arrangement of "united pastors" the congregations were subordinate to synod, and as the lay delegates had no voting power at synod, the pastors were the ruling body. The pastor of the congregation ruled the elders, the pastor and the elders ruled the congregation. And the "united pastors" had the rule of the individual pastors, who could place a man at a congregation or take him away as they saw fit, and the congregation had to submit. (Bente, I, p. 78.) In addition, all pastors and congregations were subject to the Fathers in Halle. (Bente, I, p. 80 ff.)

The unionism of Muehlenberg is evident from the fact that he exchanged pulpits with ministers of other denominations, e. g., with Episcopalians. When Whitefield, the evangelist, came to Pennsylvania, he was invited by the Ministerium (1763) and took part in their service. He also occupied Muehlenberg's pulpit. At the dedication of Zion Church in Philadelphia (1769) the whole non-Lutheran clergy was invited. Episcopal ministers delivered addresses, and Muehlenberg thanked them publicly for the part they had taken.

At one time a union of Lutheran and Episcopal churches was contemplated. It is difficult to account for the fact that Muehlenberg and Wrangel believed that there was no serious difference of doctrine. It is also true that Lutheran ministers (for instance, Muehlenberg's eldest son, Peter Gabriel, afterwards Major General under Washington) went to London to receive the Episcopalian ordination. This, however, was probably done chiefly because in the Southern Colonies the Episcopalian ordination alone was recognized by law. (Ferm, *The Crisis in American Lutheran Theology*, p. 18.)

Dr. H. E. Jacobs suggests another explanation of this inconsistency. He ascribes the tendency toward union with the Episcopalians to the times of dejection that came over Muehlenberg and his co-workers when they compared the manner in which other denominations received financial aid from Europe with the niggardly way in which the German Lutherans were taken care of. He says: "If there was any time when, even for a moment, Muehlenberg entertained the suggestion of transferring the care of the Lutherans of Pennsylvania to the Church of England, it was only at such times when he and his associates in synod were allowed to struggle on under burdens almost unaided, while union with the Church of England would at once have provided all missionaries sent thither with an appropriation almost sufficient for their sup-

port and with far better protection against the prevalent disorder. If the Lutherans in Europe could not meet the demands of the hour, we can pardon the thought, which never became a fixed purpose, that sooner than have the thousands for whose care he felt himself responsible neglected, some other mode of relief would have to be sought. However, they never denied their confessional viewpoint. Everywhere and at all times they taught and preached as true Lutherans. They never for friendship's sake would be silent concerning a Lutheran doctrine or deny the full consequences of the teachings of their confessions."

In conclusion, let me add a few tributes paid to H. M. Muehlenberg by men of prominence in the Lutheran Church in America, statements which stress the characteristics that made up his true greatness. Dr. A. Spaeth in his life of Krauth says: "In missionary zeal, in pastoral tact and fidelity, in organizing ability and personal piety, he had no superior."

Dr. H. E. Jacobs: "Depth of religious conviction, extraordinary inwardness of character, apostolic zeal for the spiritual welfare of individuals, absorbing devotion to his calling . . . these were combined with an intuitive penetration and extended width of view, a statesmanlike grasp of every situation in which he was placed, an almost prophetic foresight, coolness, and discrimination of judgment, and peculiar gifts for organization and administration."

Dr. A. L. Graebner: "Where could a second man have been found at that time who would have proved equal to the task in the same measure? . . . Muehlenberg was splendidly equipped, both as to degree and variety of gifts which a missionary and organizer has need of. And from the first day of his planting and watering God gave a rich increase to his labors, so rich that Muehlenberg could say with a grateful heart: 'It seems as though now the time had come that God would visit us with a special grace here in Pennsylvania.'"

Dr. Krauss: "Muehlenberg continued faithful in things both small and great. . . . He was the counselor of poorly served congregations, the judge in their quarrels. Confidence was everywhere reposed in him. By reason of his talent for organizing, his erudition, but, above all, his unselfishness, his modesty, dignity, and piety, he was in universal demand, and was compelled to take the lead, which he also kept till his blessed departure from this world."

Muehlenberg's body was laid away just outside his old church at New Providence (Trappe). A marble slab over his grave bears the inscription:

Qualis et quantus fuerit, non ignorabunt sine lapide futura saecula
Who and what he was future ages will know without a stone

W. G. POLACK

What Makes for Effective Preaching?

The question to be discussed is not, Is the Word of God effective? The Word of God has divine power in itself, which we can neither take away nor to which we can add. However, the sorry thing that we can do is to hinder the Holy Spirit from exerting His divine power through the Word. From this viewpoint the question under discussion will be considered. Therefore, the shrewd Scotch woman who was asked to give her view concerning the power of the pulpit was not wrong when she said, "That depends on wha's in it."

In discussing the question concerning the effectiveness of preaching, consideration must be given to the *preacher's attitude* towards his sermon work, the *contents* of the sermon, the *sermon structure*, and the *delivery*.

I

A man's *attitude* toward his work makes all the difference in the world in reference to the results which he will achieve. Any workman who desires to serve God and his fellow-men will be interested in his work, faithful in his service, do even hard labor cheerfully, and, as time goes on, seek to perfect himself. Some one has said, "If only a cobbler I be, the best of all cobblers I'll be." Preaching is not an easy task. Any preacher who gives little time and attention to his sermon work, is not, and cannot be, an effective preacher.

The minister of the Gospel, who is to instruct others to perform the duties of their calling faithfully, "not with eye-service, as men-pleasers, but in singleness of heart, fearing God," doing their work "heartily, as to the Lord and not unto men," "serving the Lord Christ," Col. 3:22-24, and who is to be an example which others should follow, Phil. 3:17, should above all men take the right attitude toward his work. What that attitude should be Paul expresses in these words written to the Christians at Thessalonica, saying, "We were bold in our God to speak unto you the Gospel of God with much contention. For our exhortation was not of deceit nor of uncleanness nor in guile; but as we were allowed of God to be put in trust with the Gospel, even so we speak; not as pleasing men, but God, which trieth our hearts. For neither at any time used we flattering words, as ye know, nor a cloak of covetousness; God is witness; nor of men sought we glory, neither of you nor yet of others, when we might have been burdensome, as the apostles of Christ. But we were gentle among you, even as a nurse cherisheth her children; so being affectionately desirous of you, we were willing to have imparted unto you not the Gospel of God only but also our own souls, because ye were dear unto us,"

1 Thess. 2:2-8. Faithfulness to God, "which trieth our hearts," and love to the souls, "which God purchased with His own blood," Acts 20:28, and which should therefore be "dear unto us" — these are the motives which should determine the preacher's attitude toward his sermon work. These motives will prompt the preacher to be faithful in his sermon work, invoking God's blessing for divine enlightenment and for such a presentation of His Word that the hearers will be edified, Eph. 4:12. Such an attitude on the part of the preacher will make for effective preaching.

II

If a sermon is to be effective, it must have the *right contents*. Modernistic preaching which fails to present the very fundamentals of the Christian religion cannot be effective preaching. Such preaching, if done by a man of erudition, may delight those who can appreciate its literary and linguistic value; and by presenting ethical precepts it may encourage civil righteousness; but it cannot be effective as far as the sinner's salvation and a Christian life are concerned. When we speak of preaching, we have in mind the Christian preacher; the preacher who preaches the Word of God, which alone is "able to make man wise unto salvation through faith which is in Christ Jesus," 2 Tim. 3:15.

However, a preacher may preach the Word of God — all that he says may be taken from the Bible and be strictly orthodox; nevertheless, his preaching may not be effective in serving the real purpose of preaching. The preaching of the Law of God will bring a man to a knowledge of his sins, Rom. 3:20, but only the preaching of the Gospel will turn sinners, in true repentance and faith, to their Savior for forgiveness and everlasting life, 1 Cor. 1:21-24; 2:2. By the preaching of the Law, Christians are told what God's will is in reference to the life which they should lead, Ps. 103:17, 18, being the children of God, 1 John 3:10, and the "salt of the earth" and "the light of the world," Matt. 5:13-16. But the Law cannot persuade them to do what is right and pleasing to the Lord; that alone the Gospel can do, Rom. 12:1; 2 Cor. 8:8, 9. A preacher will, for instance, not preach effectively on Christian giving if he tries to pry open the purses of his church-members by the demands of the Law, instead of, by means of the Gospel, filling their hearts with the love of Christ, so that, like the Macedonians, they will first give their own selves to the Lord and thereupon also cheerfully give Him their money, 2 Cor. 8:1-9. To try to accomplish with the crowbar of the Law what only the sunshine of the Gospel can do, does not make for effective preaching. He who would preach effectively must know *when* and *how* to preach Law and Gospel, so that each remains in its own sphere and is applied as

the needs of the hearers demand. (See "Law and Gospel" and "The Third Use of the Law" in the Formula of Concord; also Walther's *Gesetz und Evangelium*, done into English by W.H. T. Dau.)

Especially does it need to be emphasized that preaching, in order to be *Christian* and *effective*, must be *Gospel*-preaching. Every doctrine of the Bible is so closely linked up with the name of Jesus that without this it loses its significance and its value for man; be it the doctrine of God (who has revealed Himself through Christ), of sin (from which Christ has redeemed us), of grace (given in Christ), of faith (which is in Christ), of the Word or Baptism or the Lord's Supper (which are means of the grace procured by Christ), of predestination (unto God's adoption of children by Jesus Christ unto Himself), of creation (the ultimate purpose of which is the glory of God which sinful creatures can give Him only through Christ), of divine providence (which is assured to those who through Christ seek first the kingdom of God and His righteousness), of the angels (who are ministering spirits sent forth to minister for them who shall be heirs of salvation through Christ), of Satan and his evil spirits (from whose power man has been redeemed by Christ), of the Holy Spirit (by whom sinners through the means of grace are brought to, and kept with, Christ), of the Church (which is the communion of believers in Christ), of death and hell (from the horrors of which Christ has brought us redemption), of the resurrection unto eternal life (which is assured us in Christ), of the final Judgment (which those need not fear who are justified by faith in Christ). And as far as good works, or the Christian life, are concerned, the love of Christ is the only effective motive power.

It seems strange that any Christian minister should say that in some sermons he finds it difficult to preach Christ or, which means the same, the Gospel. Even if the text itself has no trace of any Gospel, as when sermons are preached on the Ten Commandments or allied texts, the Christian preacher dare not close his sermon without giving the comfort of the Gospel to those who have been made conscious of their sinfulness and have been terrified by the curse of the Law. The Law is not to be preached for its own sake; the ultimate purpose of all preaching is the salvation of the sinner (justification and sanctification) and the glory of God. If preaching is not Gospel-preaching, the world does not need it. It is because of the lack of Gospel-preaching that the Church in our country is in a deplorable condition. The Lutheran Church, if it remains true to its heritage and its Confessions, is a Gospel Church. Gospel-preaching is effective preaching. While to those

who reject it it is the "savor of death unto death," "in them that are saved it is the savor of life unto life," 2 Cor. 2:14-16.

Since the preacher is also a sinful human being, living in the same sinful world as his hearers and having the same spiritual needs which they have, his own needs will in a large measure direct him in determining the contents of his sermons. The attention which a preacher gives to the salvation of his own soul and to his own spiritual life will to a large extent influence him in his spiritual ministrations not only in his *Privatseelsorge* but also in his pulpit work.

III

Effective preaching calls for a *good sermon structure*. The material for this structure is supplied by the Word of God. Out of this material the preacher is to build his sermon.

I am taking it for granted that the preacher uses a text, a selected portion of Scripture. If the preacher does not intend to preach his text, why use a text at all? The very reading of the text is a promise given to the congregation that the preacher will preach that text. If this is not the intention, why then read a text? The text should, therefore, not be a mere pretext, but *contain sufficient sermon material*, so that the preacher will be kept from uttering only mere platitudes, truths well known to the hearers; otherwise his sermons may have breadth but no depth. The text should be chosen in accordance with the needs of the hearers, as these are determined by what agitates their mind and heart at a particular time and what must be told them under certain circumstances. By way of example: for the last Thanksgiving Day sermon a preacher, taking the path of least resistance, chose Col. 3:15, "Be ye thankful," as his text. This text simply states the fact that we should be thankful; it says nothing about *why* and *how* we should be thankful. The text does not furnish sufficient sermon material; the preacher himself had to supply it. He may or may not have done so. He likely spoke in general terms about material and spiritual blessings; perhaps he said nothing or little about how we should show our thankfulness, neither gave special attention to what was agitating the minds of his hearers at a time when they were living in a world of great distress. The preacher would have done better to choose a text which covers all that, as: "Blessed be Thou, Lord God of Israel, our Father, forever and ever. Thine, O Lord, is the greatness and the power and the glory and the victory and the majesty; for all that is in the heaven and in the earth is Thine; Thine is the kingdom, O Lord, and Thou art exalted as Head above all. Both riches and honor come of Thee, and Thou reignest over all; and in Thine hand is power and might; and in Thine hand it is to make

great and to give strength unto all. Now, therefore, our God, we thank Thee and praise Thy glorious name," 1 Chron. 29:10-13. In accordance with this text and existing conditions the preacher could have used the following theme, *In Spite of the Great Distress in the World We Can and Should Cheerfully Observe Our Thanksgiving Day*, showing *why* we can and should do so, and *how* we can and should do so.

1. *Why?* (a) Because in spite of heavy taxation, high cost of living, uncertain economic future, it is God who gives us our *material* blessings, vv. 11, 12. He who has all things plentifully and who has told us to pray, "Give us this day our daily bread," will not forsake us. Even the world war, though we should become involved to a greater extent than we are now, should not make us lose courage, for *God still reigns*, v. 12; and, after all, His plans, not those made by man, will be carried out, and His plans are made in the interest of His Church. (b) Because God is the Giver of all our *spiritual* blessings. "The Lord God of Israel, our Father, forever and ever," vv. 10, 13, is also our God and Father in Jesus Christ. — Application: What the text tells us about God, who is even our God, must fill us with cheerfulness, courage, and a spirit of thanksgiving.

2. *How?* (a) By acknowledging the greatness and power and glory, etc., of God, vv. 10-13; (b) by thanking and praising Him, v. 13; (c) by giving evidence of our thankfulness. That the words of v. 13 were not empty words can be seen from the context, vv. 1-9, 14-17. — Application: Let our thanks be expressed not only with our lips but also in cheerful and liberal contributions for the support of the church, for the poor, for other good causes, and in deeds of love shown to our neighbor. Reading the text again would make a good effective conclusion.

A very brief introduction leading up to the theme with a *striking opening sentence*, a theme that is not general but specific for its particular text and thus colorful, a presentation of the subject matter in logical progression of thought expressed in clear and simple language, the use of illustrations (picturesque words, similes, metaphors, pertinent short story), good applications (especially of doctrinal subjects), and a sermon kept within the time limit of about thirty minutes — all this makes for effective preaching.

The structure of the sermon (outline and sermon manuscript) should be the preacher's own. Much preaching is not very effective because it lacks *originality*. He who makes a study of the history of preaching will find that there always have been sermon-thieves, preachers either too lazy to make their own sermons or not able to do so. There are those who excuse this evil practice. They say, it is better to deliver a good sermon of some other preacher

than a poor one of your own. But it is a practice that cannot be approved. Some one has said that of all thieves the pulpit thief is the worst; and some one else said that a sermon-thief rarely reforms.

In this article our concern is not the dishonesty of plagiarism, but the fact that it does not make for effective preaching. In her book *English Preachers and Preaching* Caroline F. Richardson relates the following incident: "When Adam Eyre and his fellow-parishioners were trying to make their vicar leave and promising him £40 if he would do so, they drew up a certificate against him, the third article of which reads: 'that during all the time of his being here, which is near 3 years, hee hath preached, though sometimes twice a day, yet either altogether or, for the most part, other men's works; and one thing 4 or 5 tymes, or oftener, repeated on so many several dayes, without any progresse at all, only tyreing the tyme with tautologies and vaine iteracions. . . .'" It is evident from this complaint that the preacher's congregation during the three years of his ministry was not much edified with his preaching. Preaching "altogether, or for the most part, other men's works" does not satisfy.

Be it understood that there can be no objection to using other men's thoughts and any facts which are gotten from books or from other sources. I have been surprised to find few books in some minister's studies; and I fail to see how they can do efficient work with such few tools at hand. Every minister ought to have a good working library and — use it. It is the mere taking over, "altogether or for the most part, other men's works" as so much *ready-made material* that is objectionable. In the printed instructions given to our students for the writing of sermons, it is said, among other things, that they should do their *own mining and minting*. The preacher who does not dig into his text, make his own outline, study the needs of his congregation, write his own sermon, will never be a very successful preacher. If he is not sufficiently interested to study his text, think it through, try to present it well, and apply it to the needs of his people, how can he expect that his congregation will be interested in his preaching and be edified thereby? Such a preacher may "hold down his job," his congregation may not ask him to leave and may not offer him a sum of money if he will do so, yet he will fall under the condemnation of that layman who a number of years ago wrote a letter to a member of our faculty in reference to poor preaching. Among other things he said: "No doubt our pastors have a great deal of work to do already, much more than they ought to have. Especially is this the case in large cities like ours. There are visits to the sick, meetings of the men's club, young men's club, junior club, missionary work,

canvass of the unchurched, ladies' aid, girls' club, hospital work, athletic associations, clerical committees, etc. It is important work, most of it, and everybody seems to be heartily in favor of it.

"But, after all, the sermon's the thing. The paint on your automobile may be dazzling, the upholstery luxurious, there may be head-lights and tail-lights and spot-lights galore, balloon tires, and four-wheel brakes; but if the car won't run, it doesn't get you anywhere. The business of an automobile is to run, and the business of a church is to preach.

"In each sermon the pastor ought to give the impression that he has done some work, some reading, some writing, some thinking, for this particular sermon. We must feel that he has chosen a subject which needs to be explained to his congregation; that he has himself mastered it, not merely years ago, when it first came to his attention, but that he has gone over it again for this discourse; that he has worked it over in his mind until he is thoroughly familiar with it. Then that he has thought about the best way of presenting it to his hearers; for even a subject most familiar to the speaker may demand great skill for the proper presentation to an audience. One of my teachers used to insist that the chief problem for a teacher and, we may add, for a preacher is to keep one lesson 'from testifying to another,' that is to say, from imitating it.

"But besides giving the impression that he has worked for each particular sermon, a pastor ought also to show evidence of having done some general reading and thinking since he left school. I would like to know that my spiritual adviser was taking an intelligent interest in religious matters, that he was really qualified to speak about problems of belief and conduct and not merely repeating like a parrot the topics in which he was drilled at school. Has he read any worth-while books in the last five years? Has there been any advance in his religious knowledge, any conscious strengthening of his faith, or has he stood still? Is he growing warmer, or is he growing colder?

"Of course, this growth presupposes that there be something to grow on, a good education and preparation for the ministry. The governing bodies of our Synod have the solemn duty to see to it that the candidates for the ministry are properly qualified.

"We might here raise the question whether our educational system is in the best possible shape. Is it thorough enough? Is it efficient? Does it encourage initiative and originality? Does it create a desire to grow through hard work, or does it condone lazy habits of thought?" *

In answer to the question, What is the real secret of effective

* Printed in *Magazin fuer Ev.-Luth. Homiletik*, Vol. 49 (1925), pp. 251, 252.

preaching? Alexander Loewentraut has written his *Sieben Geheimnisse der Predigtkunst*. Among these he mentions *die eigene Ausarbeitung des Konzepts der Predigt*, the preacher's own, original sermon manuscript. He says: "*Wirksam ist eine entlehnte Predigt nicht*," a borrowed sermon is not effective. He adds: "One need not be a professional homiletician in order to detect at once whether a preacher has decked out his sermon with his own or with borrowed plumes. In the latter case, good and important thoughts are usually spoken quickly and without expression; it all makes the impression of something that has merely been committed to memory." That does not make for effective preaching.

IV

Many a good sermon has been spoiled by a poor *delivery*. It is difficult to understand some preachers; they speak in too low a tone of voice (a very common fault); they do not pronounce their words distinctly; they drop syllables; they utter the last words of a sentence in a muttering way; they speak too rapidly; they do not emphasize properly or not at all; they do not speak naturally in a conversational way but recite what they have committed to memory; they show no animation in gestures, facial expressions, and bodily movements. It was not very complimentary when an actor said: "We actors speak fiction as if it were truth; while you preachers speak truth as if it were fiction." Such preaching cannot be very effective; it does not put the message across.

A speaker, be he a preacher or a platform orator, must so speak that his audience cannot fail easily to hear every word and to understand the thoughts which his words should convey to the hearer. The very least that can be expected of a speaker is that he speak *loudly*, so that he can be *heard* by all; *distinctly*, so that he can be *understood* by all, speaking neither too rapidly nor too slowly; and *in a lively manner*, so that he makes the impression that *he is interested* in that in which he is trying to arouse interest in others.

Speaking well must be learned, even as other things must be learned that are to be done well. Mere eloquence is not enough. When Aeschines had delivered an oration, his audience would say, "How well he speaks!" But when Demosthenes had delivered his Philippics, his hearers cried out, "Let us march against Philip of Macedon!" Demosthenes moved his hearers not to mere admiration but to *action*; that was effective speaking. When Peter preached his great Pentecostal sermon, his hearers were moved to ask, "What shall we do?" "And the same day there were added unto the Church about three thousand souls." That was effective preaching.

J. H. C. FRITZ

Outlines on the Wuerttemberg Epistle Selections

Fourteenth Sunday after Trinity

2 Pet. 1:2-11

Marvelous titles are given to Christians in Scripture. Cp. John 15:15; Rom. 8:14-17; Eph. 2:19-22; 1 Pet. 2:9, 10. In our lesson Peter tells his readers that they are partakers of the divine nature, v. 4. In commenting on this passage, Luther writes: "This is a statement, the like of which is not found in the New or the Old Testament." (St. L., IX:1349.) Let us study this passage.

The Christian's Fellowship in the Divine Nature

1. *Its glorious reality*
2. *Its imperative implication*
3. *Its marvelous outlook*

I

In distinction from the modernistic, pantheistic doctrine of the immanence of God in natural man, Peter teaches man's natural depravity, vv. 4, 9. Cp. chap. 2:12-22. We are not by nature in fellowship with God. We became (see original γένησθε) partakers. We entered into fellowship with the divine nature by the great and precious promises of the Gospel of Christ Jesus, v. 4, and these promises have their origin in God's glory and virtue, His divine power, v. 3. To create man required but a word. To recreate us into His fellowship, to redeem us from the power of the devil, required a battle which Almighty God alone could carry out; cp. Ps. 49:7, 8; 2 Cor. 5:19-21. Whatever we now have of the things that pertain unto life and godliness is due to this almighty grace, v. 3, and was given to us when He brought us to the knowledge of God and our Savior. Cp. John 17:3. Included in these gifts is the fellowship in the divine nature. We have escaped corruption, v. 4; cp. Heb. 9:14; 10:22, and are now God's children, created in His image, in righteousness and holiness, spotless before Him through Christ Jesus. Luther asks, "What is God's nature?" and answers, "It is eternal truth, righteousness, wisdom, eternal life, peace, joy and bliss, and whatever may be called good. Everyone in fellowship with God's nature receives all these gifts so that he lives eternally and has everlasting peace, bliss, and happiness and is pure, clean, righteous, and all-powerful against the devil, sin, and death. Therefore Peter means to say, As little as one may deprive God of eternal life and truth, so little can you be deprived of them. Anything done to you is done to God; if anyone wants to suppress a Christian, he must suppress God." (St. L., IX:1349.) What a truly marvelous gift based on a truly immovable foundation: God Himself, His divine power, glory, and virtue, v. 3.

2

Having escaped, etc., v. 4, we should neither become blind nor forget our purging from old sins, v. 9, by remaining barren, etc., v. 8b. The very fact that we are in fellowship with God implies that we must be diligent in good works, that we prove by our lives that we are indeed no longer servants of sin and Satan, but are fellowshiping with God. We should not permit the tree of our faith to remain without fruit. We are to add, i. e., supply (as the good tree supplies fruit just because it is a good tree) virtue in keeping with our faith. Our life, our deeds, our words must agree with our profession of faith. Cp. Titus 2:10b. Explain each of the items, vv. 5-8, and make the proper applications. The strength to live up to this implication we receive by the very fact that God has taken us into fellowship with Himself.

3

V. 10. By being diligent in good works we make our calling and election sure. That is to say, we grow in our own assurance that we are truly children of God, called in time and chosen in eternity. Serving sin burdens our conscience with guilt and robs us of our assurance of salvation. Diligence in good works (and only works performed by faith are good works) proves to us that we are children of God. Serving God continually in good works we "shall never fall," v. 10; cp. Heb. 10:38, 39. As we have supplied good works, so God will richly, in a measure far exceeding any merit or worthiness on our part, supply to us an entrance into the everlasting kingdom of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, v. 11. Not because of our good works, but because these works prove that by God's omnipotent grace we also have become twice-born men, John 3:5, 6, received into communion with the divine nature. Picture the glories of this eternal kingdom and close with an earnest admonition to diligence in good works in view of the unmerited marvelous grace we have experienced.

TH. LAETSCH

Fifteenth Sunday after Trinity

1 John 2:12-17

To His disciples Christ says: "No man can serve two masters. . . . Ye cannot serve God and Mammon," Matt. 6:24. This warning is necessary, because the Old Adam in believers sinfully and stubbornly clings to the things of this world, sometimes causing them to fall. Saul, 1 Sam. 15:1 ff.; Demas, 2 Tim. 4:10; Col. 3:1, 2; Judas, John 12:6. We have every reason to consider

God's Earnest Command "Love Not the World"

1. To whom this is addressed
2. What it implies
3. Why we should heed it

1

The command is earnest, but flows from true, divine love, which is eager that those whose sins are forgiven for Jesus' sake should not fall from grace, v. 12. The expressions used in this verse describe those to whom the command is given as sincere Christians. The endearing address "little children" depicts them as God's beloved children, whom He desires to keep in His love. They are God's dear children through faith in Christ ("for His name's sake"), in whom their sins are forgiven.

The apostle next specifies the "little children" according to their station in life, adding to each descriptive noun weighty words impressing the command, v. 13. The *fathers* know Christ, have a mature knowledge of Christ, good Christian discernment. Compare for contrast 1 Cor. 3:1 ff. Explain the words repeated for emphasis in v. 14. The *young men* have overcome the Wicked One, the devil, v. 13; they are strong, v. 14; Eph. 6:10. Through faith in Christ they have fought a good fight when they renounced the world and became Christians. To young men strength is particularly becoming; to Christian young men, *spiritual* strength. They are strong because the Word of God abides in them, v. 14. The *little children* have known the Father, v. 13, have learned to love God the Father in Christ Jesus with childlike, genuine affection, 2 Tim. 1:5; 3:15.

God, then, addresses the command to *all* Christians, old and young, including mothers, young women, little girls. To all, in a peculiar way, the world is alluring. Older people are attracted by wealth; young people by pleasure; smaller children by deceivers of all sorts. Eccl. 7:20; Is. 64:6 Phil. 3:12; Ps. 119:9. Sons of Eli, 1 Sam. 2:12; Absalom, 2 Sam. 15; boys at Bethel, 2 Kings 2:23, 24. David, 2 Sam. 11. Achan, Josh. 7. Gehazi, 2 Kings 2.

2

The command reads, "Love not the world." That does not mean (a) that we may not rightly love God's creatures nor enjoy legitimate pleasures, Gen. 2:15 ff.; Ps. 145:9, 15, 16; (b) that we should make arbitrary church rules, abstaining from smoking, moderate use of alcoholic beverages, etc., such as the enthusiasts enact, who do not properly distinguish between adiaphora and things which God's Word forbids. Point out Luther's Christian joyous life. Fictitious piety is not piety at all but transgression of God's Law.

To love the world and the things in the world is to make them our treasure, our idol, and to put our trust in them, instead of in God. Matt. 6:19-34. God here forbids every sinful desire and use of the world. Study for illustrative material Luther's excellent explanation of the First Commandment in his Large Catechism.

In particular, to love the world means (a) to obey the lust of the flesh, 2 Pet. 2:10; Rom. 13:11 ff.; (b) to serve the lust of the eye, Ps. 119:37; Prov. 23:5; Rom. 3:18. Buechner describes the lust of the eye "as sinful and forbidden evil desire, as when one is moved by inordinate passion to feast his eyes on things which mislead into sin, Eve, Gen. 3:6; David, 2 Sam. 24; 11:2 ff.; (c) to be governed by the pride of life, Ps. 73:2 ff. The pride of life is inordinate elation and self-gratulation because of earthly goods and possessions. Forbidden are all evil desires of sex and the stomach, of the eye and the heart.

Do we need this command and warning? The very command accuses us. Let us beware. Gal. 6:7,8. Let us remember Israel, 1 Cor. 10:1-12.

3

We should heed this earnest command of God in view of (a) God's great love toward us, which prompted the warning, v. 12; (b) God's ineffable blessings conferred on us, vv. 13,14; (c) the destructive effects of such love of the world, vv. 15,16; (d) the vanity of such sinful world love, v. 17a; (e) the eternal reward of grace which obedience to this command offers, v. 17b; Ps. 1:23; Rev. 7:9 ff.

We who have been endowed with God's Word in all its truth and purity have special reasons to be faithful and renounce the world, Rev. 2:10; 3:11. The present war teaches us an earnest lesson supporting the command of the text, Matt. 24:6,7,37 ff. The Lord is at hand! 1 Pet. 4:7.

J. THEODORE MUELLER

Sixteenth Sunday after Trinity

1 John 2:28 to 3:8

All men without exception are born as sinners, Rom. 3:23, and are under the curse of the Law. But through the Gospel differences are brought about among men in their relationship to God. Many indeed remain enemies of God, but others through divine grace are brought to faith and therefore become sons of God, Gal. 3:26. This blessed relationship with its effects upon a Christian's outlook and life St. John would have his readers keep in mind.

We Christians Are Sons of God

This fact is reflected

1. In our hope for eternity
2. In our striving against sin

1

Christians are the recipients of God's love to the extent that they are called sons of God, 3:1. This title indicates the high esteem in which God holds those who believe. They might therefore also

be expected to hold a position of eminence and honor in this world. But such is not the case. Christ already told His disciples that they would be in danger on account of their faith, Matt. 10:22; that they would be persecuted, John 15:20. St. John in 1 John 3:13 speaks of the hatred of the world against the Christians.

The apostle explains that this hostility of the world against the Christians is what naturally might be expected. The world takes the same position over against Christ's disciples as against Him, for "it knew Him not," v. 1. The world had no use for Christ at that time, and its attitude has never changed. Furthermore, adversities in this life should not offend the Christian, because his hope of deliverance does not center on this world but on his life in the world to come. Therefore "it doth not yet appear what we shall be," v. 2.

This state of affairs might offend some Christians and make them waver in their faith. Above all, they are "little children," 2:28; 3:7, a term of endearment as well as an allusion to weakness. Though in straits, they are encouraged to "abide in Him," to continue in firm faith in Jesus, so that they can stand before Him with joyfulness on the Day of Judgment, v:28. Then their hope will be realized, and they will enter into their full glory. They will be like Jesus, 3:2. Cp. also Rom. 8:29 f.; 1 Cor. 15:49-53; Phil. 3:21; Col. 3:4. They shall see Jesus as He is, v. 2. Cp. also 1 Cor. 13:12. To see Jesus in His Word is the true Christian's greatest joy on earth. How much greater will be the joy of seeing his Lord face to face in eternity. Blessed sons of God who can look forward to such glory in the world to come as the culmination of their faith.

2

From the hope that he will be like Jesus naturally follows that the Christian already in this life seeks to become like his Lord so far as this is possible, v. 3a. Christians, as sons of God, must strive against sin. The apostle does not declare that Christians ever are sinless. He gives no support to the claims of the perfectionists. That the Christian, too, still sins, he indicates emphatically 1 John 1:8. This declaration he does not retract. Cf. also Luther's explanation of the Fifth Petition. Sin's inroads on the Christian's life are regrettable, but real. Christians do transgress the Law and so sin, v. 4. What the apostle wishes to emphasize is that sons of God do not live in sin. Sonship and slavery under sin are incompatible, v. 6a. Christians are now spiritually alive, Eph. 2:1, 5; Col. 2:13. Therefore the Christian purifies himself of his sins, v. 3. This is a continuous process; cf. also Luther's Catechism, Baptism, Fourthly. The power to strive successfully against sin comes from Christ's achievement in our behalf, v. 8b and v. 5.

The apostle issues a stern warning against living in sin. In

those early days there were deceivers who maintained that a life of sin could be harmonized with discipleship. They sought to pair Christ with Belial. The apostle minces no words in placing this attempt in its true light, v. 6b, even more than that, v. 8. He that lives in sin loses his sonship with God and becomes a child of the devil.

A timely warning also for our day. Deceivers are abroad who seek to tear down the barriers between Christ and the world. Christian faith and life are reduced to a minimum, and withal the assurance is given that such as follow these false prophets still are sons of God. We Christians should be on our guard and not permit ourselves to be deceived. We have a criterion by which to judge, v. 7b. Sons of God do what is right in the sight of their heavenly Father. By their fruits these false prophets shall be known, Matt. 7:15-20. Let us be on our guard since no more dreadful lot could overtake us than to lose our sonship with God.

Truly, the dangers that beset the sons of God are great. We are weak, but our strength lies in abiding with Jesus, and therefore we pray, *Lutheran Hymnal*, 417:6. GEO. V. SCHICK

Seventeenth Sunday after Trinity

Heb. 4:9-13

The natural enmity of man against God manifests itself in his attitude toward God's Word, Law and Gospel. Man rejects both. He refuses to submit to the Law of God, boldly transgresses its demands, resents its threats and regards them as unjust and cruel. The Gospel fares no better. The salvation it offers is neglected, Heb. 2:3; the plan ridiculed, 1 Cor. 1:22, 23. The Letter to the Hebrews exhorts Christians not to follow this natural inclination, 2:1-3; 3:7, 12; 4:1. A similar warning admonition is recorded in our text.

Beware of Neglecting the Word of God!

1. *It is a living Word, piercing soul and body*
2. *It will judge us on the Last Day*

1

V. 12a. The word of a man increases in power with the measure of his authority. The Bible is the Word of the living God, Heb. 3:12; 10:31; Ps. 36:9a; Jer. 23:36; of God Almighty, Is. 40:26, 28. Hence it is a living Word, 1 Pet. 1:23, never aging, never out of date. It is powerful, energetic, always active, Is. 55:11; Ps. 147:15. Shall we neglect this Word?

God's Word pierces soul and body, 12b. That is the effect of both Law and Gospel in both believers and unbelievers.

The Law of God, written in the heart of man, Rom. 2:15, and speaking to man in the Bible, in periodicals, through his fellow men, over the radio, convicts man of his sinfulness, Rom. 3:20; pierces his heart, rouses his antagonism against God, Rom. 4:15; Ex. 5:12; fills him with fear, often needless, Ps. 14:5, often well grounded, Heb. 2:15; affects his body, his joints and marrow, cp. Ps. 32:3, 4; hardens his heart, Heb. 3:13, 15, 16. Compare Smalc. Art., Part III, Art. II, *Trigl.*, p. 479. — This soul- and body-piercing power of the Law is experienced by the believing child of God throughout his life. Read penitent David's lament, Ps. 6:1-8; 38:1-11; Habakkuk's plea, chap. 3:1, 16; Paul's description of the constant struggle of the flesh against God's Law, Rom. 7, and you will realize the truth of Heb. 4:12; cp. Jer. 23:29.

The Gospel preached to unbelievers in like manner pierces soul and body. Christ assures us that the unbeliever, when hearing the Gospel, will be convicted by the Holy Spirit of its truth, John 16:8-11; and He tells Saul: Acts 9:5. And what heavenly joy permeates the body and soul of a believer when he by the grace of God is brought to faith and a new life by the Gospel of life and light. 2 Cor. 4:6; 3:17, 18; Is. 57:15-19; 61:1-3; Ps. 51:8. On the piercing, penetrating power of God's Word cp. Is. 6:8; Jer. 20:7, 9; Luke 24:45; Acts 2:37; 16:14, 30; 24:25; 26:24-28; 28:24-29. Shall we neglect this living Word?

2

Text, v. 12c. The Word of God is a discernor, one able to judge, to pronounce a correct sentence on the basis of the facts. Its discerning power is not restricted to the outer works; it is able to judge also the thoughts and intents of the heart, thoughts being the product of emotion or passion, intents of calm, logical reasoning. The inmost hearts, its feelings, its desires, its schemes, its motives, all lie naked and open to the eye of the all penetrating Word, v. 13b, which strips man of all natural or artificial covering, penetrates through all excuses, and demands of every individual, 13a, an answer to its double question: the one of the Law, Have you fulfilled the Law? Mark 12:30, 31; the other of the Gospel, Have you accepted Christ as your Savior? What shall our answer be? Shall we neglect that great salvation, that eternal rest and bliss, offered to all mankind, vv. 9, 10, by living in sin and serving it rather than the living God, or by relying on our own righteousness rather than the righteousness of Jesus which is revealed in the Gospel? Let us heed the solemn warning, v. 11. Then we shall in time and eternity experience the saving and sanctifying power of the Gospel and make the Law of God the norm of our life. Then we shall enter into that rest remaining to the people of God.

TH. LAETSCH

Miscellanea

Extra-Lutheran Witnesses for the Papacy as the Antichrist

It is sometimes stated by men who apparently are not well acquainted with the literature on the Antichrist that the identification of the Papacy with the Antichrist is a doctrine peculiar to the Lutheran Confessions and in particular to the Synodical Conference and its associates. Over against this supposition we could easily fill reams of paper with quotations from authors who were definitely not "Missourian" in their doctrinal and confessional stand. But from the great mass of literature we select only two excerpts which definitely show that students of Holy Scripture and the history and usages of the Church have been compelled to see in the Papacy the "Antichrist," "the man of sin" spoken of in various passages of Holy Writ, notably in Daniel, 2 Thessalonians, 1 John 2, and the Book of Revelation.

Our first witness is a treatise called *The Lantern of Light*, written about the year 1400. It contains three chapters of special interest in this connection, namely, "What Is Antichrist in General?" "What Is Antichrist in Special with His Three Parties?" and "What Is Antichrist in Special with Five Conditions?" Chapter IV of this treatise reads literally:

"Of the great chief Antichrist that in a special manner bringeth forth false laws against Jesus Christ and pretendeth himself to be most holy, the Lord God thus teacheth by the prophet Isaiah 9. (ver. 15.) A man of great age and worshipful, holden of the world, he is head and chief Antichrist. A prophet or a preacher teaching leasing, he is the tail of this Antichrist. Of this tail speaketh St. Peter more plainly and saith, These are spiritual merchants that shall chaffer with the people in feigned words, and with their sugar-likorous speech they beguile the hearts of the innocents.¹⁾ For Jude saith, They shall worship the persons of men because of winning. This tail of Antichrist shall not preach freely."

Various passages are then quoted, Rev. 13:16, 17; 14:9—11; Zech. 11:15, 17; Rom. 8:9; Rev. 16:10, 11, with an application of them to the Romish prelates of that day. Then follows: "Lincoln²⁾ saith, 'I quake, I dread, I am in horror, I am afraid, but I dare not be still, lest peradventure that sentence fall on me which the prophet saith, Isaiah 6, Wo to me, for I have stilled. The well, the beginning, and the cause of all ruin and mischief IS THE COURT OF ROME.' Now, by the one authority of God, and one accordance of his holy saints, follows an open conclusion firmly grounded in true belief, that in the court of Rome

1) Simple people.

2) Grossthead. He resisted the Pope's profligate demand that he should allow an Italian boy to hold a benefice in his diocese. For this he was cited to Rome; the near view he had of the papal court fully convinced him it was Antichrist.

is the head of Antichrist, and in prelates is the body of Antichrist, but in those clouted sects, as monks, canons, and friars, is the venomous tail of Antichrist.

"How this Antichrist shall be destroyed, God himself teacheth by the prophet Daniel and saith, This Antichrist shall be destroyed without hands, that is, without power of man. For Paul saith, 2 Thess. 2, Christ shall slay Antichrist with the spirit of his mouth, that is, with the holy word of his law. And the Lord shall destroy him with the shining of his coming, that is, with turning of men's hearts by his grace, to his law, a little before the doom."

Our second witness is John Jewell, prominent English divine, Bishop of Salisbury, who in the middle of the sixteenth century published his *Exposition upon the Two Epistles of the Apostle St. Paul to the Thessalonians*. We quote from his discussion of 2 Thess. 2:3 f.: "The most cruel of any (oppressions) that ever were, are, or shall be, is the cruelty of ANTICHRIST. By him the church of God shall suffer great tribulations, such as were not from the beginning of the world; and then shall his fury increase and his tyranny be the greater, when his kingdom shall decay, and the days of his desolation shall be at hand. Primasius saith, 'Then shall Babylon come to the ground, when she shall last of all take power to persecute the saints of God.' For then will God arise, and will judge His own cause; He will deliver the afflicted, and will slay Antichrist with the breath of His mouth.

"Let us look into the church of Rome, and behold the usage and behavior thereof. Where shall we find that heavenly comeliness which St. Paul requires? Where is the comfortable reading of the Scriptures? Where are the people taught their salvation in Christ Jesus? Where is the brotherly meeting of all the congregation at the communion of the Lord's supper? May we say of Rome, that it holds fast the form and fashion of that church which Christ and his apostles left unto us, and which the holy ancient fathers continued? Nay, rather, we may say of them with Chrysostom, 'They may have the chests and coffer wherein the treasures were sometimes kept, but the treasures they have not.' We may say, It is not now a house of prayer, but a den of thieves: we may say, It shall no more be called Bethel, the house of God, but Bethaven, the house of vanity, or of lying.

"Jupiter and Bacchus, and the idols of the heathen, were not so dishonored of their worshipers, as the almighty and everlasting and only true God is dishonored in that synagogue. I speak of Rome as it is now, and as it hath been these many years. For in the time of our elder fathers, it had great testimony of true holiness. Ignatius called it 'most chaste.' Tertullian said, it was a happy church, because the apostles of Christ suffered martyrdom in it, and left their whole doctrine unto it.³⁾ And in like sort did others give unto Rome, as it was in those times, reverend and worthy commendation. But now saith he, O Rome, how much art thou changed from the old Rome! Thou which

3) Ignatius was martyred at Rome, A.D. 107. Tertullian lived at the commencement of the third century.

hast been the chief in all the world, art now the chief in all naughtiness. They have forsaken the manner of life, and the love of the Gospel, which they of old time had in Rome, and therefore cannot be inheritors of their commendation.

"Thus the apostle speaketh of Antichrist: he is the man of sin, and the son of perdition. It will be somewhat hard to treat of this matter and to open the words of this Scripture. Whatsoever I shall speak, it will be ill taken of many, and many will doubt of the truth of my speech; such affection they bear to him whom the apostle deciphereth to be Antichrist. Albeit whatsoever I utter in opening the apostle's words shall be such, as the Holy Scriptures and learned writings of the holy fathers have left unto us, and the church of God hath proved, and at this day doth prove to be true.

"But what shall he do whereby he may be known? Paul saith, Which is an adversary. This shall be the mark whereby you may know him; he shall set himself against God, and against Christ, for he is an enemy of the cross of Christ. Why then, say you, are not the Jews, and Mahomet, and the Turk, either all, or the most wicked of them, so called, seeing they utterly refuse all Christian religion? Because none of these sit in the temple of God, which is the place where Antichrist shall advance himself; and because Antichrist shall not in open show set himself against Christ, as doth Mahomet, and the Turk, but subtly and craftily, like an evil and ungracious servant. He will not openly speak his blasphemies, or spit at the gospel of God, or defy the name of Christ; but he will call himself 'the servant of God'; perhaps, 'the vicar of Christ'; and perhaps, 'the servant of God's servants'; or perhaps, 'the head, or the chief member of the church.' ⁴⁾ He shall say he is led with the zeal of God's house, and shall do nothing less; for he shall seek himself; he shall say, he seeks the glory of God, when all that he doth is for the enriching and ambitious enlarging of his own worldly pomp and vanity.

"In matters of princes, if any man take upon him the name of an ambassador, or deputy to a prince, having no commission thereto, and in this boldness presume to levy and raise a power, and force the subjects to follow him, although he work all this under the name, and by the color of the prince's authority, as is the manner of rebels to do, yet he is a traitor, and his doings are not well thought of because he deals in the prince's matters without warrant from the prince.

"Even so Antichrist; he shall come in the name of Christ, Yet will he do all things against Christ, and under pretence and color of serving Christ; he shall devour the sheep and people of Christ; he shall deface whatsoever Christ hath taught; he shall quench that fire which Christ hath kindled; those plants which Christ hath planted he shall root up; he shall undermine that house which Christ hath built; he shall be contrary to Christ; his faith contrary to the faith of Christ, and his life contrary to the life of Christ. Is any man desirous to see Antichrist? His coming shall be notable; it shall astonish the world. By this mark you may know him; he shall be contrary to Christ. To show you at large this

4) Titles assumed by the Popes.

contrariety, by comparison of things contrary in Christ and Antichrist, would ask long time. It shall be sufficient that we consider only some few wherein they are manifestly contrary, that by them judgment may be made of the residue.

"St. Paul saith, Heb. 10: With one offering hath he consecrated forever them that are sanctified. And again: We are sanctified by the offering of the body of Jesus Christ once made. What is he then that saith, I make priests to offer a daily sacrifice for the sins of the people, by whom the offering up of the body of Christ is made every day? He is contrary to Christ; he is Antichrist.

"St. Paul saith, Eph. 1: God hath appointed Christ over all things, to be the Head of the church. What is he then, which saith, I am the head of the church? which saith, All the churches of God are knit in me; you must understand as I understand; you must hear with mine ears, and see with mine eyes; I will govern and direct you? He is contrary to Christ; this is Antichrist.

"Christ ordained that the communion should be ministered under both kinds, Matt. 26: — What is he, then, that delivers it to the people but under one kind? He is contrary to Christ: he breaks the first institution of the Lord's supper; he is Antichrist.

"Christ saith, John 18: My kingdom is not of this world. — What is he then, which saith, I am lord of lords, and king of kings: I have right to both swords; my power and authority reacheth over all the kingdoms of the world? He is contrary to Christ; he is Antichrist. Christ washed his disciples' feet, John 13. — What is he then, that gives his feet to be kissed of kings and emperors? He is contrary to Christ; he is Antichrist. Christ paid tribute to Caesar, Matt. 17. — What is he then, that exempts himself and his clergy from the temporal sword and authority? He is contrary to Christ; he is Antichrist.

"Christ allowed marriage, and reprov'd fornication. — What is he, then, that allows fornication and forbids marriage? He is contrary to Christ; he is Antichrist. Christ saith, John 5: Search the Scriptures. — What is he then which saith, Give not that which is holy to dogs, neither cast pearls before swine; ye may not search the Scriptures? He is contrary to Christ; he is Antichrist. These are the certain and undoubted marks of Antichrist.

"Here methinks I see the secret motions of your heart. You look that I should name THE BISHOP OF ROME, that it is he who hath suffered himself to be called by the name of God. I will not tell you in mine own words. Unless the bishop himself so speak, I will not tell you. Mark then, and witness of my indifferency,⁵⁾ whilst I speak hereof; that I follow not affection, but deal uprightly. Therefore I say again, unless the bishop himself suffer himself to be called by the name of God, I will not say of him so.

"Then let us see what he has written of himself, and what he has suffered others to write. Pope Nicholas saith, (Dist. 96): It is well known, that the pope was called God by the godly prince Constantine.

5) Impartiality.

And therefore pope Pius, in his bull, saith, No man dare obey her, (queen Elizabeth,) or her will, or commandments, or laws, upon pain of our curse.⁶⁾

"The pope was well content to suffer Christopher Marcellus, one of his parasites in the council of Lateran,⁷⁾ to say unto him, 'Thou art another God in earth.' The pope is content so to have a division of tenures made between him and God, as the poet Virgil some time flatteringly wrote: 'The emperor divides his rule, and holds half with Jupiter.' In the Extravagants it is set down, 'Our Lord God the pope.'⁸⁾ Mark these words: Our Lord God the pope. In them the pope is called Lord, and is called God. Oh! merciful Lord God, who from the heavens beholdest this vanity, how great is thy mercy in suffering this?

"I devise not this; his own books, his own doctors, his own decrees and decretals, speak it, and set it down. 'To believe that our Lord God the pope might not decree, as he decreed, it were a matter of heresy;'⁹⁾ it is so written there, he has heard it, he has seen it, he knows it is so, yet he suffers it to go abroad, and thereby suffers himself to be called God.¹⁰⁾ He has burnt many saints of God and holy men, for no other cause, but for the profession of the Gospel. He has in many places burnt the Holy Bible, and such books as teach nothing but godliness. Where did he ever burn—what speak I of burning? where may it appear that ever he controlled any for so writing, or called in such speeches?

"But you say, The pope at this day is not called God; he rather abases himself, and writes himself by a title of humility, and is called, The servant of servants. Be it so, that he is so called, and so written. Yet he is king of kings, and lord of lords. This servant saith, I do make holy the unholy; I do justify the wicked; I do forgive sins; I open and no man shutteth.—This servant can say, Whosoever obeyeth not me, he shall be rooted out.—This servant may dispense with any commandment of the Old and New Testament.—'This servant has Christ's lieutenantship, not only over things in heaven, over things in earth, and over things in hell, but also over the angels, both good and bad.' No man may judge this servant; for they say, 'The pope is exempted

6) "We do command and interdict all and every the noblemen, subjects, people, and others as aforesaid, that they presume not to obey her or her monitions, mandates, and laws. And those who shall act otherwise, we bind with the same sentence of anathema." Pope Pius V. bull of condemnation of Elizabeth, queen of England, 5.

7) Concil. Later., sess. 4.

8) Extrav. Johan xxii. The extravagants were decretals of the Popes, added by them to the canon law, so called because they were not arranged in the body of the law.

9) *Ibid.*

10) Pope Pius arrogated this power to himself in his bull against Queen Elizabeth. Paul IV., who was pope a few years earlier, expressed himself still more strongly, saying, "The Roman pontiff who governs in earth as the vicar, and in place of (vices geret) God and our Lord Jesus Christ, and obtains fulness of power over nations and kingdoms, and is judge of all, and not to be judged by any one in the world." See, Bullarii Rom. 1638. Bulla 19, Paul iv.

from all law of man.' And again: 'Neither all the clergy, nor all the whole world, may either judge or depose the pope.' Such a power this servant of servants claims to himself. What greater power may be given to God? what angel, what archangel, ever had the like power?

"And this power even at this day pope Pius challenges as proper to his seat; that he has the authority which is due to Christ over his church; that no man may judge him, nor say he doth err, nor ask why he doth so. He is invested in the privilege of his church, and loses no one jot of his dignity. It is yet good at this day, which hath been set down, 'It is sin, as great as sacrilege or church-robbing, to reason of any of the pope's doings.' These are their own words, God knows, before whom we stand this day, they are their own words, and not mine. Thus does he sit in the temple of God, showing himself that he is God.¹¹⁾

"And therefore may we say, as Eusebius said, 'This is an evident token that they hate God, because they will have themselves called by the name of God'; or as Gregory, who, speaking of Antichrist, said, 'Whereas he is a cursed man, and not a spirit; he feigns himself by lying to be a God.'"

Four Concordances

The re-publication of Walker's *Comprehensive Concordance to the Holy Scriptures* by the MacMillan Company, 1941, calls for a re-valuation of the four concordances available for use with the Authorized Version. This all the more, in view of the remarkably low price—\$2.00—at which Walker's concordance is being offered. It is a well-bound book of 957 pages. Without pretending to be exhaustive, we offer a comparison between Walker's book, Cruden's, Young's, and Strong's.

Walker's *Comprehensive Concordance to the Holy Scriptures* was the work of the Rev. James Bradford Richmond Walker, born in Taunton, Mass., April 15, 1821. He was graduated from Brown University in 1841 and from Andover Theological Seminary in 1846. As a pastor he served churches in Maine, Massachusetts, and Connecticut. He died on January 24, 1885. The introduction to the new MacMillan reprint cautions the user not to expect an all-inclusive work, containing every a, an, in, the, this, that, not, so, he, her, etc. It is offered as "a simple concordance, strictly alphabetical in arrangement, even to proper names, with passages and references under each alphabetical head in correct Biblical order." Proper names are always accented to assist in pronunciation. The page is clearly legible, and the book itself is compact and pleasing in size and appearance.

Of Cruden, first published in 1737, the most recent edition is that published by the John C. Winston Company in 1930. As to size, Cruden's has 783 pages of informative material. The print is the same size as Walker's although of a different type face. Walker's is simply an alphabetical digest of the Authorized Version. Cruden's indicates material changes made by the Revised Version and the American Revised Version.

11) Bellarmine states that the whole sum of Christianity is concerned in the doctrine of the Pope's supremacy.

Turning at random the pages in both concordances, let us stop at the term "man" and compare their method of presentation. Cruden's: "God said, Let us make m. [italicized] in our image (Gen. 1:26, 27; 9:6)." Walker's: "Gen. 1:26. God said, Let us make m. [heavy print] in our image, 27—9:6." Cruden's gives an explanation of the term "man" in the words 1) a human being, 1 Cor. 10:13; 2) the human race, mankind, Job 5:7; 3) the adult male, as distinguished from a woman or a child, Acts 4:22. Walker's, on the other hand, gives no such unfoldings of the concept. The topic "man" in Cruden is treated under the general head "man," then "a man," then "a certain man," "any man," "man-child," "every man," "man of God," "mighty man," "no man," "of man," "one man," "Son of Man," "that man," "this man," "man of war," "wicked man," "wise man," "man joined with woman," "young man." In Walker the arrangement of texts is controlled by the following heads: "man," "a man," "a certain man," "any man," "man-child," "every man," "man of God," "like man," "mighty man," "no man," "of man," "old man," "one man," "poor man," "rich man," "righteous man," "Son of Man," "that man," "this man," "man of war," "wicked man," "wise man," "man with woman," "young man." I have italicized the sections which Walker has added to Cruden's under "man."

Robert Young's *Analytical Concordance to the Bible* was first published in Edinburgh in 1879. It was reprinted by Funk and Wagnalls in New York in 1917. Young's is a much larger book than either Cruden or Walker. For the additional weight and size, Young's has approximately eight words per line against five and a half in Walker's and in the 1930 edition of Cruden. In endeavoring to locate a text, the additional words quoted in Young offer a material advantage.

Like the two previously mentioned, Young's is a complete concordance. Walker's occasionally has a word not listed in Young's, as "pool" and "rye" (listed as "rie"). But Young lists "skull," which is missing in Walker's. I am unable to account for these variations.

The chief distinction of Young, however, is that each term has its texts listed, not according to such rather arbitrary divisions as we noted for "man" in Walker's and Cruden's, but according to the Hebrew and Greek originals. Turning to "mountain," Walker groups all his texts under these headings: "mountain," "high mountain," "in mountain," "mountains," "in the mountains," "of the mountains," "to the mountains"—thus compelling one who is searching, *e. g.*, for the location of "sacrifice upon tops of the mountains" to look under two or three heads. Young has all Old Testament texts containing the English words "mount" and "mountain" under the five Hebrew terms so translated, and all the New Testament under the single Greek term *oros*, giving six subdivisions for the term "mountain" in this concordance. Young also gives a transliteration and accurate translation of each Hebrew or Greek stem. The various tenses of a verb are listed under the stem, as *moved* under *move*. In Walker's these are listed separately. For Biblical study Young offers a Hebrew index-lexicon to the Old Testament and a Greek index-lexicon to the New. Every Hebrew and Greek word is here listed in transliteration, and the various English terms by which it has been

rendered are listed below. This makes possible a thorough study of any term or concept either of the Old or New Testaments.

James Strong's *Concordance* was published by the Methodist Book Concern in 1890. Strong offers no subdivisions whatever under the various terms. There is one tabulation, beginning with Genesis and ending with Revelation, for the word "man." However, all these references are co-ordinated with a "comparative concordance" and a Hebrew and Greek dictionary at the end of the volume. Numbers are appended to each line of quotation, indicating that the leading word in the passage quoted is there the translation (in the Authorized Version) of the Hebrew or Greek word correspondingly numbered in the Dictionaries in the later portion of the work. For instance, for Matt. 9:30, under "man" we find the line:

Saying, see that no m. know it 3367

This is followed by a line from verse 32:

they brought to him a dumb m. 444.

The figure 3367 leads us to the Greek word *medeis* (no one), while 444 is the word *anthropos* (man). With every reference in this very complete work—it contains also terms which we have failed to discover in Walker's and Young's—thus traceable to its Hebrew or Greek origin, we have an arrangement superior to Young who, as noted, forms groups of references in the body of the work under the various Hebrew or Greek originals. Only for a student who habitually studies his Bible with reference to the original tongues will the arrangement in Young's prove superior.

We also note that Strong supplies in his *Comparative Concordance* (a section of 261 pages) a complete digest, by books, chapters, and verses, of the Authorized and Revised versions, including the American variations.

In conclusion we note that Cruden is frequently sold in inferior editions printed from old, sometimes badly damaged plates (not the case, however, with the Winston Edition), while the MacMillan reprint of Walker is apparently newly set up and the type, while very small, easily legible. Cruden is usually sold for \$2.00, the price of Walker's is \$2.00, Strong's \$5.00, and Young's \$7.50.

THEODORE GRAEBNER

Shall We Have a Lutheran Nuptial Mass?

The Lutheran Church of America, in some of its areas, seems to have entered upon an era of repristination, not so much in the doctrinal field, where, generally speaking, such a course would not be amiss, as in the field of liturgics. Now, there can be no doubt that many liturgical customs come under the heading of adiaphora, so that their observance is a matter of Christian liberty and within the jurisdiction of the individual congregation. On the other hand, those who would use the true Lutheran liturgiologist's approach might do well to study, not superficially, but intensively, *all* the liturgical writings of Luther, in order to

understand fully the principles which this careful student of Scripture emphasized in making his own suggestions in the field of liturgics. Many of these principles have been referred to in the more than two-score articles in this field of theological learning which have appeared in the pages of this periodical in the twelve years of its existence. A few fundamental considerations, for example, were broached in an article which appeared last year (Vol. XII, 589 ff.), and others will be found in practically every volume of the series, if one will but take the trouble to consult the table of contents and the shorter items appearing in the section "Miscellanea."

In this particular connection we have in mind chiefly two articles. One was printed in Volume II, 818 ff., and is headed "Die Sakramente in ihrer Beziehung zur Gemeindeorganisation." The other is found in Volume XI, 598 ff., and discusses "The Means of Grace from the Administrative Angle." In either case emphasis is laid, on the basis of the Word of God, on the fact that the Lord's Supper, or the Eucharist, in agreement with its institution, the doctrinal directions connected with its celebration, and its history, is definitely a function of the Christian congregation. The celebration of the Eucharist by conventicles, *ecclesiolae in ecclesia*, as in the case of the Pietists, the Stundists, and other enthusiasts, has always been definitely condemned by the teachers of our Church. Group communions which are not included in the regular congregational setup, making congregational supervision difficult or impossible, are not in agreement with the obvious intention of Him who established the Sacrament of His body and blood also in token of the inner communion of the true believers and for the furtherance of this fellowship. In the early Church this consideration was so strongly emphasized that, at every Communion in the regular meeting-place of the congregation, officers of the church, usually subdeacons, brought the sacred elements to the sick and shut-ins, so that all communicant members might always be included in the common celebration of the Lord's Supper by the congregation. A part of these considerations underlie also the practice of the "reserved Sacrament," and we rightly recognize the element of emergency in communing the sick in their own homes.

The Roman Catholic sect has for centuries observed a special form of private or votive mass, one which is now most intimately interwoven with its ceremonies and usages. This is the so-called "nuptial mass," a special celebration of the (mutilated) Eucharist as the Roman Church observes it in connection with holy marriage. In a recent leaflet missal this ceremony is called "The Mass on the Day of Marriage." Its essential feature is this that the newly married couple, in the rite of the Catholic sacrament, receives the Eucharist alone.

Now, the Roman sect makes much of this specific form of celebration. The Catholic Encyclopedia declares that this celebration goes back to the days of Tertullian, although, as Bingham shows in his *Christian Antiquities* (Vol. 7: 334 f.), the assertion is not beyond a certain doubt. And there is by no means a full agreement in the best liturgical writings as to the introduction of the nuptial mass as early as the third century. It seems clear that all teachers of the Church who carefully studied the

doctrinal background of the Sacrament understood that a Communion service connected with the ceremony of giving in marriage was not in harmony with the obvious congregational function and setup presupposed by its establishment. As we know, Luther definitely did not include a nuptial mass in his *Traubuechlein* of 1534, and if one studies his writing *Von der Winkelmesse* of 1533 (St. Louis Ed., 19, 1220 ff.), the reason will be obvious. The English writers in the field of liturgics were, on the whole, ready to continue the custom which had become established. Procter, for example, in his *History of the Book of Common Prayer* (p. 444) has the remark: "The Reformed Service, like that from which it has been derived, ended with an administration of the Holy Communion, the rubric being expressed in positive terms, 'The new married persons, the same day of their marriage, must receive the Holy Communion.' This was altered in 1661, in compliance with the objection of the Presbyterians, or more probably from a conviction that many persons would be married according to the rites of the Church who were far from being in communion with it." (Cp. Gwynne, *Primitive Worship and the Prayer Book*, 338 f.; Lee, *Directorium Anglicanum*, 206 f.). It is significant, as Gwynne points out, that the "American Church (the Protestant Episcopal Church in America) has omitted the remaining portions of the service in the English Book," while the English, Scottish, and Irish Books lead on to the Holy Communion. In other words, where the Protestant viewpoint was emphasized more strongly, the opposition against associating the ceremony of holy marriage with a sacramental character was more pronounced.

The correct answer to the question proposed in the caption of this brief discussion, in keeping with fundamental doctrinal considerations and proper liturgical expression of the tenets and traditions of Lutheranism must of necessity be negative. As stated above, the Lord's Supper presupposes a congregational setup, since it is a congregational function and involves a representative congregational participation. A Lutheran nuptial mass, furthermore, is not an emergency, since both bride and groom may and should partake of the Sacrament in their own congregation before their marriage, where they may be properly examined by their own pastor, as the Lutheran Confessions prescribe, and then as soon after the marriage ceremony in the congregation of which they both are members, where the same supervision and control of the admission to the Sacrament may be exercised. Nor may we overlook the fact that an introduction of a Lutheran nuptial mass will certainly be connected with a false sacramentalism, an attitude which is bound to lead to a misunderstanding concerning holy marriage. For this, according to the words of Luther, is in itself a "weltlich, irdisch Ding," and is sanctified only by the Word of God and prayer, as we have it in our beautiful marriage ceremony.

P. E. KRETZMANN



Theological Observer — Kirchlich-Zeitgeschichtliches

At the Foot of the Cross.—Under this heading Rev. F. R. Webber sends us the following appealing report with the request that it be given space in the CONCORDIA THEOLOGICAL MONTHLY. The article is valuable because it stimulates interest in our work among our young men in the service of our country and strikingly emphasizes a few truths which we are apt to forget only too easily. Pastor Webber writes:

"One evening in June a group of young men in uniform were gathered informally in the basement of a parish house. They were not there to bowl nor to play billiards, although a good bowling alley and billiard tables were but a few feet away. The subject under discussion was a special little chapel for the service men. They themselves, not the pastors with them, brought up the subject. These were our own Lutheran boys.

"One Sunday in July a dozen or so Lutheran soldiers and seamen sat around a long table in a New York restaurant. One of their first remarks was, 'When are we going to get our little chapel?'

"One Sunday evening in July a young soldier from one of our congregations sat for an hour with a pastor, urging that such a chapel be fitted out. 'We have a non-denominational chapel at our fort, and you'd be surprised the number of boys of all denominations who use it for private devotions.'

"These three incidents took place at our new Parish Center of Synod's Army and Navy Commission. The location of this center is 316 West 46th Street, just a block off Times Square. There, close to the crossroads of the world, and in the amusement center of our nation, these lads spent their time of leave, not in visiting Broadway burlesques and near-by cinemas, but speaking in behalf of a little chapel all their own, in some secluded corner of the handsome five-story white-stone parish house where our New York Lutheran Parish Center is housed.

"'We fellows are giving everything,' said one fine young man. 'There is a troop movement overseas in numbers that nobody outside the Army and Navy realize. If our Church only knew the size of this troop movement, they'd be astonished. Whatever we do for these fellows here in New York City may be the last contact with our Lutheran Church that many of them will ever have.'

"Social agencies assert that war means a let-down in morals for both sexes. That may be true in many cases. It is equally true that many of our young men from the Christian day schools and confirmation classes think of their religion in such times as these. When within sight of the port of debarkation, they want the Gospel and the Sacraments.

"Of the many boys who visit our center weekly, the first question is usually, 'May I announce for Holy Communion?' They want their own little chapel, where, as soon as the sermon is over, they may retire

for the special Service Men's Communion, which is held weekly because so many of them are here but a Sunday or two. They want a little corner in the parish house, a peaceful Bethel, where they may drop in for private meditation and prayer, or where the padre (the soldier's slang for a clergyman) may pray with them.

"If war brings out the worst in some men, it brings out the best in others. Many a tired old pastor, and many an overworked parochial schoolteacher would have a new song of gladness in his heart could he but sit for one week in any of our various service centers and observe that the seed that he had sown is bearing fruit. Not all our boys, by any means, seek only free theater tickets, dances, and sight-seeing trips when in a big city. Many of them, mindful of the instruction of Christian parents, pastor and teacher, give up the precious hours of their leave seeking a Church where the Gospel and the Sacrament may be found."

J. T. M.

The Meeting at Columbus, May 15, 1942.—On account of the importance of this meeting, our journal, though its readers have seen accounts of it elsewhere (we are thinking, for instance, of the interesting, objectively written report from the pen of Dr. W. G. Polack, which appeared in the June 9, 1942, issue of the *Lutheran Witness*), must reprint at least the resolutions which were adopted and submit some of the comments of Lutheran editors. At a meeting of the National Lutheran Council, held March 13, it had been resolved to hold another meeting on May 15, in which all the Lutheran bodies of our country would be invited to participate. On May 14 the special committee of the National Lutheran Council (the same men who had convened in Chicago March 13) had been in session and drafted resolutions which might be submitted to the meeting of May 15. On the latter date five members of the Missouri Synod were in attendance: President Behnken, Vice-Presidents Grueber and Barth, Director of Publicity Rev. L. Meyer, and Dr. W. G. Polack, the latter in an unofficial capacity as reporter for the *Lutheran Witness*. From President Brenner of the Wisconsin Synod a communication had come in which participation was declined because according to the conviction of his church body "co-operation, even only in externals, should not as a means to an end precede the establishment of true unity between two bodies, but should follow as the result and the expression of a Scriptural unity previously established."

The resolutions which had been drawn up and adopted by the National Lutheran Council Committee on May 14 and which were submitted to the Missouri Synod representatives for approval on May 15 are the following:

"Recognition of the seriousness of the present crisis in world affairs has prompted the National Lutheran Council to issue the call for this meeting. We believe that there is providential meaning in the universal distress and perplexity of mankind, and that these constitute a definite challenge to the church to rise to the opportunities for service created by existing conditions.

"We are convinced, however, that the Lutherans of America cannot meet their common responsibilities in the face of the present crisis

without uniting their resources, and that the divine Head of the church is solemnly calling us to unselfish sacrifice and unified effort to meet the serious problems which confront us.

"As specific proposals to meet the great needs of the hour, we advocate, therefore, the following measures:

"1. In accordance with the objectives set forth in the resolution unanimously adopted by the National Lutheran Council at its last annual meeting in regard to an American Lutheran Federation or Convention, we suggest as highly desirable the enlargement of the scope of the American Lutheran Conference, so that its constituency may become representative of the Lutheran Church in America. Pending this consummation, we recommend that the National Lutheran Council sponsor from time to time free general conferences for consultation in regard to our mutual Lutheran problems and opportunities for service, with an invitation to all Lutheran bodies to participate.

"2. In addition to the present work of the National Lutheran Council, which includes the Departments of Statistics, Publicity, Welfare Work, and Service Commission, we propose an expanded program to include closer co-ordination of its work with the activities of other existing Lutheran groups, such as the Lutheran Mission Council of America, the Lutheran Foreign Missions Conference, and the American Section of the Lutheran World Convention.

"We also recommend that the National Lutheran Council, in keeping with Article II of the Governing Regulations of the Council, undertake a study of a program of future expansion, including such projects as work among various racial groups; ministry to the deaf, dumb, and blind; publication and dissemination of Christian literature; service to students at non-Lutheran institutions; disaster relief service; portions of the work done by the Lutheran World Convention; some critical elements of the foreign mission problems; and other emergency tasks where common action is demanded."

When the Missouri Synod representatives stated that the program outlined in these resolutions was not acceptable to them, that they, however, would like to see committees appointed through whose agency co-operation in purely external affairs might be considered and facilitated, the following resolutions were adopted:

"Resolved that we have heard with regret that the Missouri Synod is not prepared to co-operate in a general Lutheran conference or convention as proposed at this meeting, and cannot at this time accept the National Lutheran Council as its agency in meeting our common responsibilities. In view, however, of President Behnken's statement that there are without question matters of purely external character in which co-operation is possible and desirable, and that in regard to any specific instances of possible co-operation, the Missouri Synod would welcome the appointment of a committee of the National Lutheran Council to meet with a committee of the Missouri Synod for the consideration of questions involved; be it resolved that we express our hope that committees may be set up for the consideration of specific instances of such co-operation in purely external matters."

Speaking of the Columbus meeting, Dr. E. W. Schramm, editor of the *Lutheran Standard*, writes, "As we sat in this memorable meeting, we thought of a portion of God's Word that is becoming increasingly meaningful and precious to us: the twelfth chapter of First Corinthians, describing the diversity of gifts which the one and the same Spirit divides to each one and to each church body severally even as He will. On the basis of that precious Word of God we say to all the Lutheran church bodies in America: We need one another. The Missouri Synod should be in the proposed Lutheran alliance for the sake of its sister synods and for its own sake. Despite its disloyalty to the Word of God in certain important respects, for example, in its refusal of prayer fellowship to fellow Lutherans—treating us as though we were Unitarians—and in its running the risk of allowing souls to go to the devil rather than recommending them to the spiritual care and fellowship of a Lutheran congregation of another synod; despite unwitting disloyalties, the rest of us Lutherans, who also have our unwitting disloyalties and human frailties, need the Scripture-loving Missouri Synod in the larger, more devoted Lutheran Church of the future. At present the Lutheran Church is not moving like a mighty army. 'No army goes to battle with a resolution on its banners.' We Lutherans of America will not make our best contribution to the life of America and of the world until we pass from the conferring and resolving stage into a real *Lutheran action stage*."

In the *Lutheran Companion* the editor, Dr. E. E. Ryden, who is the president of the American Lutheran Conference, says, "Not so happy have been the negotiations with the bodies of the Synodical Conference, which is made up principally of the Missouri Synod and the Wisconsin Synod. The latter body refused unequivocally to meet with other Lutherans at the First Columbus Conference in January, 1941, and it repeated that refusal when invited to send representatives to the Second Columbus Conference. The Missouri Synod, on the other hand, not only sent delegates to Columbus a year ago, but agreed to a measure of co-ordination of work among the service men and also to give some support to the efforts to save the Lutheran orphaned missions.

"It was this initial gesture of friendship and understanding that led to the hope that the Missouri Synod would be willing now to enter more fully into closer relations with other Lutheran groups. That hope, however, was effectively killed when the representatives of Missouri gave their answer at Columbus on May 15. As Dr. Bersell says in his 'Perspectives,' 'The door was shut by the presidential hand and the key was turned.'

"However, the decision of the Missouri Synod may not prove to be as irrevocable as it has appeared to be at the first glance. In the dark and trying days that lie before us as a Church, it will become increasingly evident to every Lutheran group that it will need the help and support that can come only through unified action. This is as true of the Missouri Synod as of any other general body. That many prominent leaders of the Missouri Synod are keenly conscious of this fact has been indicated not only in private utterances but also in articles and

editorials in the Missouri press that have been unusual for their frankness. They have made it clear that it is folly to believe that a group even as large and powerful as the Missouri Synod will be able to solve its problems independent of other American Lutherans, and we are convinced that future developments in America and the world will more than justify their judgment."

Manifestly, it is impossible to consider here all the issues raised by the resolutions which were adopted and the comments which have been quoted above. The Missouri Synod delegates, so it would seem to one on the outside, were at a disadvantage because they were not present when the resolutions for which their approval was sought were framed. Their decisions on the questions which confronted them had to be reached quickly. With respect to the Wisconsin Synod we believe that the brethren whom we love and honor for their intense desire to be faithful to the revealed truth could without showing disloyalty to the sacred Scriptures have joined in the deliberations at Columbus and expressed themselves willing to co-operate in *externis*. When the question is asked why the Missouri Synod representatives were unwilling to go a step beyond a declaration of willingness to co-operate in purely external matters, it must not be forgotten that one of the bodies asking our Synod to join it and other bodies in a Lutheran conference, the Norwegian Free Church, has openly ridiculed and flouted the doctrine of verbal inspiration, and that another inviting body, the large United Lutheran Church of America, tolerates in its midst the open denial of this doctrine. Would it be proper for Missouri to establish fraternal fellowship with people who tread under foot what it holds sacred? If at Columbus this distressing state of affairs had been recognized and some plan had been adopted through which, prior to the forming of a larger conference, the evil condition might have been remedied, the case would have been different. But the premise on which the resolutions were based was that there exists a sufficient unity for the inauguration of the comprehensive program that was envisaged. It was not the presidential hand of Dr. Behnken that closed the door, but the course taken by the National Lutheran Council representatives who, unwittingly to be sure, neglected to give to faithful adherence to Scripture doctrine that priority and eminence which rightfully belong to it. A.

The Delaware Resolutions of the Federal Council of Churches.—The religious press has reported at length on the meeting held under the auspices of a commission of the Federal Council of Churches at Delaware, Ohio. At this meeting plans were suggested pertaining to the establishment of a just order of affairs in the world when the war is concluded. Writing in the *Presbyterian*, Dr. David De Forest Burrell submits an excellent discussion of the views voiced in the Delaware propositions. Dr. Burrell states that he agrees with the critic who called the objectives visualized at Delaware "internationalism, collectivism, and materialism." The plan proposed at Delaware includes "a world government of delegated powers." There is to be a supergovernment which is to have control of all armies and navies, there is to be a world mone-

tary system in charge of this government, and the great questions that affect all nations are to be decided by it. Dr. Burrell asks quite pertinently, "Who would guarantee the integrity, unselfishness, and wisdom of the members of such a supergovernment? For what purposes would its vast armaments be employed; where would they be kept; and how would they guarantee international justice and humanity except by force? Who would guarantee the wisdom, justice, and humanity of the world-government in its other functions—social, educational, economic, and moral?" He points out that the League of Nations collapsed because not all its members wholeheartedly supported it but had secret treaties with one or the other nation. He continues, "Therein we discern one of the vital weaknesses of internationalism. These brethren in their conference, in all sincerity, propose to the world a scheme based on the assumption of human perfection, while this is in reality a world still inhabited by sinful men, selfish, proud, greedy, cruel, false. It is difficult enough to secure a fairly decent government within the bounds of a single nation; but a world-government—who is sufficient for these things? No man, no group of men. And if military power be the controlling force in the world-government, it is quite obvious that Dr. Robinson is correct in calling the proposal 'pacifism gone belligerent; the Sermon on the Mount with teeth in it; and the Gospel at the point of a gun.'"

With regard to the suggestions pertaining to the economic evil, Dr. Burrell holds that they are revolutionary and based on the view voiced by one of the speakers at Delaware that "collectivism is coming, whether we like it or not." If a socialistic system were adopted, Dr. Burrell asks, "who would dare to guarantee that in that case there would come an end to greed and cruelty and selfishness and injustice?" Dr. Burrell strikes the right note when in one of the concluding paragraphs he says, "In short, brethren, the defects in our political, social, and economic system have grown so portentous not because the system is fundamentally wrong, but chiefly because the Church of Christ in America has failed to appraise Christ adequately and earnestly to sinful men. And the Church has failed Christ here because she has not half believed in Him. If Jesus was a mere social reformer, as some have been preaching, then there is no hope for society. For—I say it in all reverence—not even a spotless social reformer could lift an unregenerate world into newness of life. But if Jesus be the Savior that some of us believe and know Him to be, then there is a very certain and sure hope for this sinful humanity. This is the conviction on which our beloved Church was founded; and it is time for us to return to it." To the above we ought to add that it is a delusion to think that ever here on earth there will be a time when conditions will be as tranquil and peaceful as the social gospel people think they can make them to be. The prophecies of the last times definitely state that conditions will grow worse as the end draws nearer. But let us remember that the Gospel of the kingdom must be preached in all the world as a witness to all nations, "and then the end will come."

A.

Unionism.—In *The American Lutheran* (April, 1942) Rev. F. R. Webber writes under this heading: "Unionism in our circles means pulpit and altar fellowship with those who teach otherwise than we do. One of the strangest communications that reached us came a few days ago on a post card, where a man who ought to know better charges that the writer of these lines (we quote) 'according to your own report not only inspected church buildings, but also took part in *services* in England.' The italics are his. He demands a printed apology. Such rubbish is hardly worth mentioning. We leave it to the reader as to whether any such statement ever appeared in print. Lest there be any others who have the same idea, permit us to make it clear that Mr. Joseph Pedlar is a Lutheran of the Missouri Synod, and the services in question, while often held in buildings owned by others, have always been Lutheran and nothing else. Mr. Pedlar has never at any time united in union services with people of other faiths. The same is true of the writer of these lines. Never at any time, either in America or in any other country, have we taken part, either directly or indirectly, in anything which by any stretch of the imagination can be considered unionistic. There has been too much of this reading between the lines and inserting things that are wholly out of keeping with the facts."

This stern rebuke of a hasty, unfounded accusation, we believe, is well deserved. Let the principles of 1 Cor. 13 not be neglected!

J. T. M.

Convention News.—Both the Northern Presbyterian and the Northern Baptist Conventions refused to accede to the request that they adopt resolutions enthusiastically endorsing the war in which our country is engaged. This attitude, so different from what we witnessed during the last war, may be due to the vogue of pacifist sentiment. We wish we could interpret it as a sign that the "social gospel" is losing its grip on non-Lutheran Protestants and that the true function of the Church, the preaching of redemption through the blood of Christ, is being recognized.

Book Review — Literatur

All books reviewed in this periodical may be procured from or through Concordia Publishing House, 3558 S. Jefferson Ave., St. Louis, Mo.

The Book of Jonah. A Message for Our Day. By H. Speckhard. Translated by R. Herrmann. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 75 pages, 5×7½. Price, 25 cents.

This little volume consists of two parts, a thirteen-page introduction, followed by an interpretation of the Prophet's Book. In the former section are taken up the questions of authenticity, historicity, authorship, the time of Jonah's activity, and a brief summary of the purpose of the Book. All this is presented in clear and simple language, avoiding almost completely such terms as would presuppose technical and linguistic knowledge. In the interpretation of the Book light is thrown upon the text from every angle that might prove helpful to bring about a clearer understanding and appreciation of the story. As the subtitle already suggests, the facts and lessons of the Book are shown to be thoroughly applicable to our modern times. In ancient Nineveh conditions prevalent in our large modern cities are seen to be closely paralleled, and Jonah's call to repentance is essentially the same as is needed at any time to recall the sinner from his headlong course to destruction. All questions arising in connection with the interpretation of the Book are simply and satisfactorily answered without recourse to the Hebrew original, which makes the volume a most valuable addition to the available literature suited for use in Bible classes and for private Bible study by our laity. Needless to say, the pastor, too, may derive many a useful thought for his sermons from this study by the sainted Pastor Speckhard, an outstanding theologian and preacher in our Synod. Thanks are due Pastor Herrmann for making this gem available in the English language. While, of course, it is impossible to reproduce in English the smooth flow of the language in which the essay was originally written, Pastor Herrmann's translation represents a very creditable achievement. The volume is easy to read except in a few isolated instances, and the fascinating presentation keeps the reader's interest alive to the very conclusion. Widespread reading of this essay will prove a great blessing and stimulate Biblical study in our circles.

G. V. SCHICK

Duties of Elders. Written by request of Synod's Literature Board. Concordia Publishing House, St. Louis, Mo. 12 pages, 4×6¼. Price, 5 cents.

This twelve-page tract written at the request of Synod's Literature Board outlines briefly the Biblical background of the office of elders, their duties in general, and finally gives a few directions for the treatment of special cases, such as non-attendance at the church services, worldliness, irreconcilability, lack of liberality in giving, neglect of the Christian home. Every congregation ought to give a copy of this tract to its

elders. It would be well to discuss the paragraphs in the congregational meetings so that the voting members would learn why they are to respect their elders and what they are to expect of them. TH. LAETSCH

The Christian Interpretation of Sex. By Otto A. Piper. Charles Scribner's Sons. New York. 234 pages, 5¾×8¼. \$2.00.

In the Editorial and News Department of *The Presbyterian* of Feb. 26, 1942, we find the following item on the author of this book: "On Monday afternoon, February 9, in Miller Chapel of Princeton Theological Seminary, Dr. Otto A. Piper, guest professor of New Testament, was installed into the Helen H. P. Manson Chair of New Testament Literature and Exegesis. . . . Until 1933, Dr. Piper was professor of Theology in the University of Muenster, Germany, where he succeeded the famous Karl Barth. Deposed from his chair by the Nazi authorities at the beginning of the Hitler regime, Dr. Piper spent four years in England. He is regarded as one of the most outstanding theological scholars of our time and is the author of many books in German and English. His English works to date are: *Recent Developments in German Thought*, *God in History*, *The Christian Interpretation of Sex*."

The last named book purports to give a Christian interpretation of sex. In the preface the author writes, "Our philosophy of sex and sex morality must be based exclusively on the Bible." (P. ix.) We subscribe to that. Yet the author has not succeeded in ridding himself of the fetters of the unbiblical theory of evolution of religion, and therefore we read in his chapter on "Genesis of Modern Views": "Before the time of the prophets, the religion depicted in the Old Testament (e.g., Leviticus 20) appears to have regarded sex from the standpoint of a dynamistic concept of reality similar to the idea of 'mana.' . . . Among the Hebrews in pre-prophetic days the view of sex, similar to that held by the other Semitic tribes, shows all the characteristics of a mana-tabu religion." (P. 7.) In the age of the prophets "a legalistic ethic resting on ceremonies, ritual, and institutions was replaced by an ethic of moral virtue. This change had a profound influence, not only on the regulation of sex life, but also on the way sex was understood." (P. 11.) "It came to be understood that the core of sex relationships can be fully realized only when there is faithfulness and love; and this new understanding reacted upon the relation between the worshiper and Yahweh," (p. 12); yet what we read Gen. 2:18, 23-25 already expresses this last truth perfectly and that in the beginning of time and the first book of the Bible.

On the other hand, the author rests solidly on Scripture when he writes, "The story of the creation of Eve from Adam's rib (Gen. 2:21 f.) makes it plain that, in this instance, man and woman are regarded as essentially belonging to each other. Sexual intercourse is, therefore, not an accidental and temporary event in the life of two persons; rather, it institutes a genuine unity ordained by God for that purpose. . . . In those far-off days, men were conscious that the sexes conditioned each other in some way. They felt that when a divine requirement had been fulfilled, a corresponding change was occasioned in man's being, quite apart from the question whether the person concerned had become conscious of a feeling of harmony or not." And again, "Moreover,

according to this early view, the physical and the mental differences of the two sexes point to some deeper-going difference, viz., that of natural status and of the human functions of man and woman. This difference affects all departments of their life. Even the empirical thinker is more inclined today than twenty years ago to grant that in no respect can a woman be man's equal, or man a woman's. At the primitive [?] stage of religion, as reflected in Genesis 2 and 3, people saw a clear sign of this difference; for instance, in the woman's two-sided character, as one who could be tempted, and who could become a temptation to man." (pp. 9, 10.)

We agree with the author when he writes, "In normal circumstances, no other human instinct expresses itself with such overwhelming force as that of sex. The Bible takes account of that fact. It does not assume that it is within human choice whether one should have sexual excitements or not. On the contrary, the Bible regards it as a special gift of God if a person does not feel the power of that instinct (cf. 1 Cor. 7:7); similarly, Jesus' saying about those who make themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of Heaven (Matt. 19:12) is probably intended in the same sense. Paul, indeed, adopts the standpoint that, in ordinary circumstances, it is impossible for adults effectively to suppress the desire for sexual satisfaction, and, from this standpoint, he recommends marriage. On the basis of a similar conviction Paul advises married people not to abandon sexual intercourse for too long a time (1 Cor. 7:5).

"This does not mean that the Bible regards an unmarried man or woman, in normal circumstances, as incapable of curbing the sex instinct. Yet the Bible recognizes that for the average individual there is a limit beyond which he is not in a position to prevent the rise of sexual desire towards another person. This does not imply that such a person is under a physiological necessity to have sexual intercourse. But the individual begins to burn, to suffer from lust (1 Cor. 7:9), i. e., he can never get free of the wish to have sexual intercourse with a certain person. This wish may be expressed in various ways, sexual fantasies, pleasure in lascivious thoughts, or self-abuse. From the standpoint of the New Testament, all these activities are as damnable as actual immoral relations with another person, because like them they include an unjustified desire for sexual intercourse with a certain person." (Pp. 38 and 39.) Yet we cannot subscribe to all he says on the meaning of the Hebrew term *to know*, used to describe the act of sexual intercourse. He says, "Three points are peculiar to knowledge obtained by sexual experience: (a) it is strictly personal knowledge, (b) its subject matter consists in the mutual relationship between the two parties, (c) it is knowledge of an inner secret," (p. 54), and concludes his remarks on point 2 by stating, "What was impossible to communicate by means of words is transmitted by the mutual affection concomitant to sexual union. Sexual contact is not yet effected as long as only one person is prepared to tune himself in harmony with another. If the other does not respond all that takes place is a psycho-physical excitement of the first person concerned," (p. 56). There is no indication in Scripture that this "knowledge" must be based on *mutual affection*

or that only such knowledge makes them one flesh. On the contrary, according to Scripture sexual intercourse with a harlot makes the two one flesh, 1 Cor. 6:15, 16, and there may be very little of "tuning oneself in harmony with the other," in fact, that may be the rule rather than the exception with the professional harlot.

"Be fruitful and multiply" (Gen. 1:28 and Gen. 9:1) is not to be interpreted as a commandment (as if a person had it in his power to produce life), but just as in the parallel passages (Gen. 1:22 and 9:7), as a blessing spoken by God, addressed to the creatures of sea and air, and later to Noah," (p. 51). By the same logic we may conclude that the word of Christ, Disciple all nations, Matt. 28:19, is not to be interpreted as a command, as if a person had it in his power to produce spiritual life! The words "Be fruitful and multiply" are imperatives, just as the "matheteusate" is an imperative. That these imperatives confer a blessing does not make them any less commands.

The author stands firmly on Scriptural ground when he writes, "The constitutive factor in marriage is not the public and legal act of our present regulations, but the will of the two persons to live together. The public and legal act is only a kind of outward declaration which the two give that they wish their bond to be regarded as formed in the eyes of all. On the other hand it is a declaration on the part of the State that to this union are granted all the special privileges of a legal marriage. But in God's sight the marriage was concluded at the moment when the two persons gave consent in their hearts to their mutual desires. Hence even the ceremony in church does not make the marriage more in accordance with God's will than it was before the solemnization. The ceremony is only God's blessing pronounced upon this bond as a Christian bond in the eyes of the Church," (p. 168). But we cannot accept his statement "that from the ethical viewpoint the life of an unmarried couple might under certain circumstances have the same value as that of life in an externally contracted marriage. It is true that in all probability their union would imply birth control." (P. 170.) His position on "birth control" is not based on the Word of God, but to too great an extent on expediency; and carnal intercourse on the part of betrothed persons before their public marriage would be, apart from other considerations, contrary to the laws of the State, therefore a sin against God's commandment, Rom. 13:1-5 and 1 Pet. 2:13, 14.

The author's remarks on celibacy, based on Matt. 19:12 (p. 108 ff.), on marital love and faithfulness (pp. 119-138), on the knowledge and burden of sin and the Gospel of forgiveness, offer rich food for thought and are worthy of careful study even if one cannot agree with all statements, and his view of sin does not do full justice to God's description of it, and his Gospel of forgiveness seems not to be based on the vicarious atonement of Christ, of which we have found no mention.

While the author frequently reads his own views and opinions into the words of Scripture, the book will serve to stimulate a careful examination of one's own opinions and a thorough and conscientious comparison of one's own and the author's views with the infallible oracles of God.

TH. LAETSCH

Bible Quiz Programs. Eight Full Programs of Fun and Excellent Bible Instruction. By Mabel H. Hansen. Zondervan Publishing House. 45 pages, 5¼×7¾. Price, 25 cents.

Some Hints for Fruitful Bible Study. By Charles G. Finney. 27 pages. Same publisher, format, and price.

These two pamphlets are intended to stimulate the study of the Bible. We frankly do not like the word "fun" in the subtitle of the first pamphlet, which is arranged very much like that by Moehlmann, recently referred to in these columns. If contests of this kind are kept serious and dignified, they may still serve their purpose very well, which is that of adding interest to Bible hours in either young people's meetings or vacation Bible schools, as the author suggests. The programs are of somewhat unequal merit, and not all questions relate to Bible topics, but the careful leader of Bible hours will be able to make selections which will best serve his purpose. — The book containing suggestions for Bible study by Finney was reprinted, as the publishers state, "in the interests of the Finney Sesquicentennial Memorial Conference," scheduled to be held in Chicago at the end of June. Among the many excellent hints for Bible students we marked rather heavily one which is placed under the heading "Some of the Advantages to Be Derived," namely this one: "A constantly increasing sense of your own ignorance." In the measure in which the student of the Bible will realize his own ignorance and turn to the guidance of the Holy Spirit alone will he derive lasting benefits from his study of the Book.

P. E. KRETZMANN

After the Resurrection — What? By L. R. Scarborough, D. D., President of Southwestern Baptist Theological Seminary, Fort Worth, Texas. Zondervan Publishing House, Grand Rapids. 121 pages, 7½×5¼. Price, \$1.00.

It is no disparagement to this book to call it a mission tract. It is a fine mission tract. It is a study of the dealings of Christ with His disciples in the forty days between His resurrection and His ascension and stresses the missionary obligation which Christ laid upon His Church. There are some fanciful illustrations and applications, a few obscurities, and two or three doctrinal aberrations, as, for instance, the statement that Baptism does not save (p. 117), but the book serves very well to impress upon us the duty and privilege of imparting to others the salvation gained through Christ's atonement for the sins of the world and enjoyed by us. "God's people must pass God's spiritual food to all classes and ages of men. There is much that rests on our hearts which is described by the debtorship of love. God's other name is Love, and He desires of us love's service. When we look at Christ's emphasis on the mission obligations in the light of love's debtorship, it becomes a mammoth affair and ought not to be shirked nor dodged nor disregarded. God allows no shift in love's obligation. Looking back over the grave and cross and Garden and the price He paid, love's redemption price, He certainly had a right to ask you and me and all of His disciples this question, 'Lovest thou Me more than these?' And one of His ascension expectations of all of us is that we seek to pay love's eternal debtorship." (P. 77.)

TH. ENGELDER